

**The Ramakrishna Mission
Institute of Culture Library**


Presented by

Dr. Baridbaran Mukerji

RN102-8

12001

THE ÆLDEST LETTERS IN THE WORLD



AMEN-HOTEP

THE OLDEST LETTERS IN THE WORLD

TELL US ——— WHAT?

BY
MRS. SYDNEY BRISTOWE



LONDON: GEORGE ALLEN & UNWIN, LTD.
RUSKIN HOUSE, 40 MUSEUM STREET, W.C.1

RMIC LIBRARY	
No N. 12001	
Class N. 735	
681	
at	
Card	✓
Card	✓
at	✓
Card	✓
Checked	ar

First published 1923

R.C.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I	THE AMARNA TABLETS - - - - -	7.
II	WHAT WAS AMENHOTEP'S RELIGION - -	15
III	THE PROBLEM OF THE "AMORITES" - -	22
IV	THE KEY TO THE PROBLEM - - - -	26
V	SIDON CONQUERED BY HEBREWS - - -	29
VI	TYRE DESTROYED BY JOSHUA - - -	34
VII	THE HABERI IN THE ISLES OF THE WEST -	39
VIII	THE SUPPOSED HITTITE EMPIRE - - -	42
IX	DUSRATTA AND HIS EMPIRE - - - -	48
X	DUSRATTA'S LETTERS - - - - -	53
XI	RIBADDI'S EVIDENCE - - - - -	57
XII	FALSE WITNESSES! - - - - -	63
XIII	COPIES—COUNTERPARTS AND FORGERIES -	70
XIV	DUSRATTA'S ASSUMED NAMES - - - -	74
XV	DUSRATTA'S PLAYFUL NAME FOR QUEEN TEIE -	83
XVI	DUSRATTA'S DAUGHTER - - - - -	91
XVII	SUBBILULIUMA - - - - -	94

David Aaron Hunkeler
10 Mega Row, Atlanta

CHAPTER I

THE AMARNA TABLETS

"I considered that a portion of the truth had been entrusted to me; I have given my opinion sincerely; let them tell me where they think me wrong."

SAMUEL JOHNSON.

IN this new interpretation of the celebrated Amarna Tablets several distinguished authorities are quoted, their statements are criticised and even contradicted.

To justify those criticisms and contradictions I must explain my conviction that in dealing with the Amarna Tablets we come up against the mystery of the Hebrew race, and that because those authorities have not realised that fact, they have not rightly interpreted the Amarna Tablets. If they had realised that fact they would, of course, have used the Bible, the obvious key to anything connected with the Hebrews, as their key to the Amarna Tablets. Because I have used that key where they have not done so my interpretation is different from theirs; for example, according to their interpretation the Phœnicians (who I propose to show were Hebrews), undoubtedly the most daring and enterprising people of ancient times, were Canaanites; whereas, according to the Bible the Canaanites were an inferior race; according to Noah's prophecy they were to be "servants of servants"—a slave race! The Canaanites of the Bible could never have become the great seafaring, exploring, conquering, colonising Phœnicians!

The historical importance of showing that the Phœnicians were Hebrews and the greater importance of proving that (upon this and several other questions) the Amarna Tablets not only harmonise with, but also throw new light upon the Bible, might in themselves justify the following somewhat controversial pages; but their chief justification to some minds must be, their effort to show by striking examples that

because the Bible Records have been ignored when they have seemed to contradict monumental inscriptions the meaning of these inscriptions has often been misunderstood.

If these pages run counter to the opinions of leading Egyptologists it is, I contend, because the Amarna Tablets elucidated by the Bible throw a powerful light (hitherto unsuspected) upon Egyptian history of the period to which they belong; that of the Eighteenth Dynasty to which are ascribed the treasures recently discovered at Thebes.

The Amarna Tablets, possibly the oldest and certainly some of the most authentic historical documents in the world, were discovered accidentally at Tel-el-Amarna in Egypt in the year 1887, among the ruins of the palace of Amenhotep the fourth, the so-called "Heretic King," to whom most of them were written about three thousand four hundred years ago.

The historical information given by the Amarna Tablets is involuntary and therefore unbiassed; the cuneiform inscriptions upon the brick tablets are letters from Canaanitish rulers of Palestine or from kings of foreign countries; they are written simply as man to man, differing in this from all other ancient inscriptions which are written in the baffling jargon of the priests, and not only ring false but can often be *proved* to be false.

These facts make the Amarna Tablets the most valuable ancient inscriptions we possess. Probably no more trustworthy history of any period exists than that to be gathered from them, of the Eighteenth Dynasty of Egypt; towards the end of which Dynasty the Conquest of Palestine by the Israelites is now known to have taken place.

About three hundred of the Amarna Tablets have been brought to Europe, some are in the British Museum, many of the most important are in Berlin. The cuneiform inscriptions upon them have been translated into English and German, and published; they are therefore open to anyone's inspection; the merest amateur may form his own conclusions from them; the result of such an enquiry is given in this paper. The great importance of the Amarna Tablets has not been recognised because apparently, the translators have been unwilling to

admit that the Israelites are mentioned upon them and that they tell of the Conquest of Palestine by Joshua! The translations shown with the Tablets now in the British Museum, give little idea of the interest of the letters, the name Haberi, Khaberi, or Aberi is hardly seen in those translations, yet that name appears frequently in the Tablets and leading philologists certify that it stands for the Hebrews (the Israelites). See *Enc. Britt.*, Ed. II., Vol. 10. p. 78. Another name mentioned upon the Tablets is Saga which is said to be identical with Haberi (*Knudtson Die El-Amarna Tafeln*, p. 51), and is proved to be so by the fact that it occurs upon the Behistoun Rock in Persia where, according to Sir Henry Rawlinson, it represents the Israelites (the Sakai or "House of Isaac").

Dr. Hall (of the British Museum) admits the fact that the Tablets tell of the Israelites' Conquest of Palestine, for he writes: "We may definitely, if we accept the identification of the Khabiru as the Hebrews, say that in the Tel-el-Amarna letters, we have Joshua's conquest seen from the Egyptian and Canaanite point of view." (*Ancient History of the Near East*, p. 409.)

Dr. Hall's dates do not agree with those given in the Bible for that event. He gives the years—"Circa 1380-1362" for the reign of Amenhotep the fourth in whose lifetime Joshua's Conquest of Palestine took place.

Major Conder, whose book published for the Palestine Exploration Society, I largely quote from, says however: "The date of the letters is exactly that which is to be derived from the Bible (1 Kings vi. 1) for the Hebrew invasion according to the Hebrew and Vulgate text (the Septuagint makes it forty years later) and it agrees with the fact that the Egyptian conquests [in Palestine] made by the Eighteenth Dynasty (1700 to 1600 B.C.) had been lost, when the Nineteenth Dynasty acceded."

Although it is now generally admitted that the Amarna letters tell of Joshua's Conquest of Southern Palestine, it has not been suggested that he also conquered Phœnicia, the north-west coast of Palestine, upon which the cities of Tyre and

Sidon were situated. On the contrary the Tablets are believed to show that, while the Israelites were conquering Southern Palestine, the cities of Phœnicia were conquered by Canaanites of the Amorite branch of that race. Major Conder writes: "Amorites conquered all Phœnicia and besieged Tyre." (*Amarna Tablets*, p. 5.)

Since the Amorites were Canaanites like the inhabitants of Phœnicia whom they were conquering, Major Conder's reading of the Tablets suggests that, although the Southern cities of Palestine were being conquered about that time by the Israelites, the Canaanites in Northern Palestine were indulging in civil war.

That both wars took place about the same time is proved, as Major Conder remarks, by the fact that the same Egyptian officials are mentioned in both the Northern and Southern letters which describe the war. ••

The theory of this strange situation in Palestine has been accepted by the translators, and Bible commentators still tell us that the Israelites never conquered Tyre and Sidon and that the Phœnicians who inhabited those cities were Canaanites.

Reading between the lines however, I conclude from the Tablets that the people called Amorites by the Canaanite rulers in their letters to Amenhotep the fourth of Egypt, and who are described as conquering Phœnicia were really Israelites who, for reasons to be explained later, were called Amorites by the Canaanites who were the first inhabitants of that land.

Most of the Amarna letters were written to Amenhotep the fourth, the last and best known to us of the three so-called "Heretic kings." (See *Times History*, Vol. I, p. 139.) He has been described as "The first individual in ancient history," a "philosophic and artistic reformer," the "first doctrinaire in history" and a "poet king." (Hall's *Anc. Hist.*, p. 298.)

Amenhotep the fourth, Dusratta of Mitanni, his father-in-law, and Joshua, the leader of the Israelites, are the men about whom the Amarna Tablets have much to tell, and about whom they clear away several misconceptions while the pagan priests of Amenhotep's and of Dusratta's countries are the false witnesses whom the Tablets unmask. The big historical

problems the Tablets help to solve are those of the origin of the Phoenicians and the identity of the people who formed what has been called the "Great Hittite Empire."

At the time the Amarna Tablets were written the country now known as Palestine, including the narrow strip of coast land known later as Phoenicia, was inhabited by Canaanites. It is called Kinahhi or Khinatuna in the Amarna letters and the land of Canaan in the Bible. The Canaanite inhabitants of that land had been conquered by the early kings of the eighteenth Egyptian Dynasty, and when Amenhotep the fourth came to the throne Palestine was in much the same position, as we gather from the Amarna letters, that India now is under the British Government. The rulers of the Canaanites, the petty kings or chiefs who fought against Joshua, were vassals of the Egyptian king, and their letters are full of appeals to him for help against their invaders, the Israelites.

The Egyptian king's empire was bounded in Palestine by the Jordan on the east, the Mediterranean Sea on the west and on the north by the possessions of his father-in-law, Dusratta of Mitanni, who I hope to show owned a great empire on the north, north-east and north-west of Palestine. Dr. Erman* writes, speaking of the Egyptian conquest of Palestine that "Egypt became the neighbour of Mitanni on the Euphrates, of Assyria and of Babylon." Those three countries were (according to Dr. Hall) probably ruled over by Dusratta.

The Tablets show that there was, in each of the Canaanitish cities of Palestine, as well as a native ruler or king, an Egyptian official called, according to Major Conder, a Paka, who was presumably placed there to guard the Egyptian interests, much as a British Resident is placed in the Indian States of to-day.

In the reign of Amenhotep the third, the Canaanites had plotted against their Egyptian masters, which fact his son, Amenhotep the fourth knew for among his correspondence upon one of the Amarna Tablets, is a letter from the king of Babylon telling him how the Canaanites had tried, some years

* *Times History*, Vol. 1.

before, to persuade the Babylonians to join with them against Egypt.

Another letter from the same king of Babylon warns Amenhotep the fourth, against the Haberi (the Israelites) who were invading Palestine at that time ; he writes, "Canaan (Kinahhi) is your land ; you are the king ; I have been violently dealt with in your land ; subdue them ! If you do not kill those people they will come again and my caravans and even your messengers they will kill ; the trade between us will be cut off and the land's inhabitants will become hostile to you." (Winckler, *Amarna Tablets*, p. 27.)

The fact that the "land's inhabitants" the Canaanites, were so ready to become hostile to the Egyptians is one to be remembered. It extenuates the apparent cruelty of that which, as we shall see, was Amenhotep's policy.

Most of the Amarna letters are from the Canaanite rulers of Palestine begging Amenhotep to protect them from the Haberi who were conquering their cities. They evidently could not understand why he was allowing the Israelites to conquer his tributary cities which they were ruling for him.

Professor Winckler gives a letter in which a Canaanitish ruler writes to Amenhotep, "Why are you favourable to the chiefs of the Haberi and unfavourable to the native feudal [?] princes ?"*

The Canaanite ruler of Jerusalem (Uru-sa-lim) writes to Amenhotep :—"Behold I say the land of the king my lord is ruined . . . the Haberi plunder the king's land ; let the king hear. . . Will he not order Egyptian soldiers ? And because there are no Egyptian soldiers the king's land has rebelled to the chiefs of the tribe of the Haberi." (Conder, *Amarna Tablets*, p. 139.)

The people who were rebelling to the Haberi may have been the Gibeonites of whom we read in the tenth chapter of Joshua ; where the king of Jerusalem calls upon other kings of Palestine to "Smite Gibeon for it hath made peace with Joshua and the children of Israel." According to Major Conder (p. 139) the ruler of Jerusalem's name upon the Tablets

* The Tel-el-Amarna letters, p. 303.

is Adonizedek as it is in the Bible. A striking excuse is made by the same king for failing to successfully resist the Haberi, he writes :—" Lo, the king will be just to me because the chiefs (of the Haberi) are sorcerers." (C., p. 148.) Probably Adonizedek had just heard of the fall of the walls of Jericho and of the miraculous dividing of the waters of the Jordan !

The Aramaic word for Sorcerer is Casapi, according to Major Conder, and Casawi, according to Professor Knudtzon. (*Amarna Tafeln*, p. 864.) This shows its relation to the Hebrew word for sorcerer which is Kashaph. (Young's *Analytical Concordance*.)

Adonizedek's sentences become despairing, he says :—" I am breaking in pieces. Let the king pluck his land from the men of blood. . . . I say to the Paka of the king my lord, why should you tremble before the chiefs of the Haberi ? And you relinquish the lands to men of blood, squandering the wealth of all the lands ; they have torn away sons and daughters and this while the king is pondering about it." (C., p. 149.)

Major Conder's expression " men of blood " is his rather mystifying translation of " Amiluti Saga " (people of the Saga) which words other authorities translate " Haberi."

Again the ruler of Jerusalem writes :—" Since the Egyptian troops have gone away, quitting the lands of the king my lord. . . . Let him be kind and let the king regard the entreaties." (C., p. 142.)

The King of Egypt did not regard his entreaties or those of other Canaanite rulers ; the letters make that clear. They state, as Major Conder remarks, that the Egyptian troops had been withdrawn from Palestine in the year that the Israelites came out of the desert. (C., p. 5.)

Another ruler reasons with Amenhotep, he says :—" Behold thy fathers did not wring, did not smite the land of his rulers and the gods established. . . ." The rest of his sentence is lost, he seems to have suspected the king of Egypt of conspiring against his own subjects ! With how much reason the letters show !

Almost rebellious remonstrances seem to be wrung from the despairing rulers of the Canaanites such as : " Let the king

14 THE OLDEST LETTERS IN THE WORLD

rescue the land from the Haberi or send chariots to rescue the loyal. . . . Why is then this overthrow of thy land? My destroyers exult in the face of my lord the king . . . he is left like the ant whose home is destroyed." (C., p. 126.)

Another ruler writes :—" Behold the king lets slip from his hand the chief city which is faithful to him . . . moreover I send for men of garrison and for horses but you care not for us . . . the city is perishing, my lord has pronounced our death." (C., p. 62.)

Very suggestively the ruler of Gebal says :—" It is not granted to my sons to take root for me. As the prophets have perceived of old, the race of the foe will remain." (C., p. 91.)

The Canaanite ruler probably refers to the promise made to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob that their descendants, the Israelites, should possess Palestine; the ruler may have recognised the fulfilment of that promise before his very eyes!

A woman calling herself—"The Lady Basmatu thy hand-maid" writes to Amenhotep :—" At the feet of the king my lord, my god, my sun, seven times and seven times I bow. . . . Know O king my lord, there has been war in the land and the land of the king my lord has been wearied by rebels, by men of blood."

The Lady Basmatu was evidently flying for her life; she ends :—" Am not I tired marching to the town of Albuba and because of not resting, O king my lord?" (C., p. 155.)

To all these entreaties and remonstrances the king of Egypt was deaf! Although the Canaanite cities of Palestine were tributary to him and must have been a source of great wealth to him, he simply left them and his unhappy subjects to their fate!

Why was this? His motive deserves investigation; he and the Amarna Tablets are mutually illuminating.

CHAPTER II

WHAT WAS AMENHOTEP'S RELIGION ?

MAJOR CONDER offers no explanation of Amenhotep's strange behaviour in allowing the Israelites to take possession of his cities in Palestine. Dr. Hall attributes it to the king's "ignorance and incapacity." Professor Petrie who also publishes the Amarna letters thinks that his "domestic affairs" "monopolised his attention." He says, "having openly broken with the traditions of his youth Amenhotep threw all his energies into domestic reforms and abandoned foreign politics with disastrous results." (*Syria and Egypt*, p. 22.)

What Amenhotep's "domestic reforms" were the *Times History* tells us. It says, "his religious fanaticism got the better of his prudence ; the cult of the god Amen was forbidden and his name erased wherever it could be reached ; the pure Egyptians disappeared from the king's entourage, giving place to Asiatic personages. . . . Thebes, consecrated to the fallen god lost its rank of capital and the king built a new capital at Tel-el-Amarna." (*Times Hist.*, Vol. I., p. 139.)

These were drastic reforms, surely betokening a radical change of heart ! According to the *Times History* "the religion which Amenhotep imbibed from his mother" was the "worship of the sundisk." Can we believe this ?

The sun was always mixed up with the Egyptian religion ; "Son of the Sun" was, according to the inscriptions one of the hereditary titles of the Egyptian kings and the sun is sometimes connected in those inscriptions with the Egyptian god Osiris !

Is it likely that, because Amenhotep worshipped the sun in some new fashion the Egyptian priests would have hated him

and have described him on the monuments over which they are known to have had control as "the heretic king" and as "that criminal of Akhnaton"? Is it likely that, while practising sun-worship only one form of idolatry, Amenhotep would have risked everything by offending the powerful priests who at that time according to the *Times History* were "able to triumph over even royalty by their wealth?"

History relates that Amenhotep closed the temples of the Egyptian gods and even proscribed the word "gods." (Hall, p. 302.)

It seems far more likely that the priests tried to hide from posterity what Amenhotep's religion really was, just as they caricatured his personal appearance, representing him and his family upon the monuments as abnormal creatures, worshipping a grotesque sun, which stretches down long arms to receive their offerings.

Dr. Hall conjectures that Amenhotep was degenerate in appearance and ordered the Egyptian sculptors to depict him as such! He writes: "Quite possibly the king developed an insane admiration for his own degenerating body, and Bek (the sculptor) and the courtiers had to pander to this perverted idea of beauty. This perversion contrasts strangely with the lofty character of the king's religious and philosophical ideas" (p. 306).

Dr. Hall's conjecture is surely disqualified by the fact that not only Amenhotep but also Amenhotep's wife, children and courtiers are depicted as degenerates! The love of truth with which Amenhotep is credited could hardly have allowed that!

A beautiful head (see frontispiece), believed to be a portrait of Amenhotep has lately been excavated at Tel-el-Amarna, not only showing what he was really like and how cruelly he was caricatured, but also showing what good work those priestly sculptors could produce if they chose. The *Times History* says "the Egyptian priests were the sculptors and painters of those days the draughtsmen, masons and scribes" (p. 200, Vol. 1).

The power of handing down the record of Egypt was therefore entirely in their hands! Can we believe what they have told us?

Whatever else Amenhotep's religion is said to have been all writers agree that it was monotheistic, the worship of one God ; his motto seems to have been " Life in Truth " or " Living in the Truth " and the following lines are ascribed to him, How " manifold are thy works, they are hidden from us, O Thou God, whose power no other possesseth, Thou didst create the earth according to Thy desires." (Hall, p. 307.) *

Professor Sayce says of Amenhotep, " Forsaking the worship of Amen of Thebes, of Ra of Heliopolis, of Tha of Memphis, he professed himself the devoted adorer of the solar disk." (*Journ. of Vict. Inst.*, Vol. 24.)

That Amenhotep adored the solar disk is evidently what the Egyptian priests wanted future generations to believe ! Their grotesque drawings upon the monuments as well as priestly inscriptions were calculated to give that impression, but surely that evident " connection with the Jewish monotheism " noticed by Egyptologists, points rather to the possibility that his religion, so hated by the priests, was the Hebrew religion ? Especially since the Hebrew religion would account as nothing else could do, not only for his allowing the Hebrews to conquer Palestine but for everything that is known about him.

Professor Breasted describes him as " a brave soul, undauntedly facing the momentum of immemorial tradition . . . that he might disseminate ideas far beyond and above the capacity of his age to understand." (*Hist. of Egypt.*)

Yet the Egyptian priests have successfully willed us to believe that it was only some slight change in the worship of the sun which Amenhotep the fourth tried to establish in Egypt.

Another Egyptologist writes : " The faith of the patriarchs is the lineal ancestor of the Christian faith ; but the creed of Akhnaton* is its isolated prototype. One might believe that Almighty God had for a moment revealed Himself to Egypt, and had been more clearly, though more momentarily, interpreted than ever He was in Syria or Palestine before the time of Christ." (Weigall, *Akhmaton*, pp. 101 and 136.)

One of Amenhotep's hymns so closely resembles the hundred and fourth psalm that Mr. Weigall says : " it becomes

* i.e. Amenhotep IV.

necessary to ask whether both Akhnaton's hymn and this Hebrew psalm were derived from a common source, or whether Psalm 104 is derived from the Pharaoh's original poem."

* As I hope to prove later, the Egyptian priests' method of falsifying the history of their country was to mix up truth with fiction. If, in Amenhotep the fourth's writings therefore we find pagan tendencies it is not surprising; in spite of all the priestly efforts to deceive us the inevitable conclusion seems to be that it was the Hebrew religion which he upheld.

Professor Lenormant in his *Ancient History of the East*, writes: "There are curious resemblances between the external forms of Israelitish worship in the desert and those revealed by the monuments of Tel-el-Amarna." He adds that some of the sacred furniture such as the Table of Shew bread described in the Book of Exodus is seen in the representations of Amenhotep's worship and says: "Had not the Hebrews some connection with this strange attempt and the imperfect monotheism of Amenhotep?"

Dr. Hall writes: "The young reformer proclaimed that the whole pantheon of Egypt was a fiction and that only one deity existed." Naturally Amenhotep was hated by the priests of Amon whose wealth and power depended upon the rites and ceremonies connected with their gods!

When Amenhotep's tomb was discovered in 1907, the *Times'* correspondent wrote: "The tomb had been disturbed but not by plunderers, some devotees of the god Amon had entered the tomb but merely for the purpose of blotting out the accursed name of the heretic!"

Amenhotep's body seems to have been removed by those "fanatical adherents of the god Amon" and replaced by another body for the deformed skull (evidently that of an idiot) of which a photograph is shown at the British Museum, is certainly not that of an energetic leader, a poet and philosopher such as Amenhotep was! The body found in Amenhotep's tomb according to Dr. Hall "shows signs of cretinism" (p. 305).

The priestly plot has not quite hoodwinked modern science; according to the *Times'* correspondent (August 3rd, 1907),

experts have discovered that the mummy found in Amenhotep's tomb is that of a younger man than Amenhotep is believed to have been at the time of his death. The correspondent writes: "It will remain to be explained how another man came to be placed in a tomb bearing his (Amenhotep's) name only, and containing many objects which belonged to him or had been given to him by his mother."

The incongruity of the fact that the mummy found in Amenhotep's tomb wears emblems of the religion which Amenhotep had discarded has been noticed by Mr. Weigall; that fact in itself is surely enough to raise suspicions that the mummy is not that of Amenhotep!

After describing one of those pagan emblems Mr. Weigall says: "It is somewhat surprising that the body of Akhnaton (Amenhotep the fourth) who was so averse to all old customs should have this royal talisman upon it." (Weigall, p. 260.)

These suspicious circumstances, combined with the priest's caricatures of Amenhotep upon the monuments and the pagan names and allusions which clash so oddly with the otherwise purely monotheistic sentiments of Amenhotep's writings (pointing to their being priestly interpolations) as well as positive proofs of the priests' system of deception which I offer later, support my hypothesis that the priests of Amon determined to disguise from posterity the true personality and religion of their hated "Heretic king." Two likely reasons exist for Amenhotep's adoption of the Hebrew religion; the first being that his mother from whom he is said to have "imbibed it" was a Hebrew or Aramæan princess. The Amarna Tablets show that Queen Thi, Amenhotep's mother, the fair-haired blue-eyed queen of the Egyptian monuments (Lenormant, p. 238), came from Northern Syria which seems to have been inhabited from the first by the descendants of Shem, the ancestor of the Hebrews. Queen Thi was the sister of Dusratta, king of Armenia and Mitanni, about whom I shall have much to say later.

His land was undoubtedly inhabited by the Hebrew race. The Hyksos who according to Dr. Hall were Hebrews came from Dusratta's land to conquer Egypt many centuries before

Dusratta's time. Abraham came from Dusratta's country and Jacob's two wives came from there ; Rachel may have had fair hair and blue eyes like Queen Thi for they both came from Dusratta's land. The Ark is believed to have rested upon the mountains of Armenia which was part of Dusratta's kingdom.

* In all probability the Hebrew religion was kept alive in that land until its revival in the time of Moses.

Coming from that country, Queen Thi may well have influenced Amenhotep's religion, and there are strong indications that his father may have also done so, but another influence existed, apparently over-looked until now, but indicated by the following facts. As we have seen, the conquest of Palestine by the Israelites took place in Amenhotep the fourth's reign. According to the Bible the Israelites left Egypt about forty years before that conquest. Amenhotep's father, Amenhotep the third, who is said to have lived about fifty years, must therefore have been alive at the time of the Exodus of the Israelites from Egypt. His father Thothmes the fourth, was also alive at that time ; he or his father must have been the Pharaoh of the Exodus ; one or both those kings must have witnessed the miracles performed by Moses in the name of the God of the Hebrews ; those awe-inspiring events explain as nothing else can do the evidence found upon monuments that both Amenhotep's father and grandfather had tried to change the religion of Egypt. According to the *Times History* the last kings of the Eighteenth Dynasty were distinguished by the name of "heretic kings." Mr. Weigall (p. 11) writes : " In the reign of Thothmes the fourth we reach a period of history in which certain religious movements are to be observed, which become more apparent in the time of his son Amenhotep the third, and his grandson Akhnaton (Amenhotep the fourth)" and "Thothmes the fourth, did not altogether approve of the political character of the Amon priesthood."

That it was religion and not politics which caused Thothmes the fourth, to disapprove of the priests of Amon is my conviction.

If the religious change began in his reign he was, I maintain, either the Pharaoh of the Exodus or that monarch's son !

Only the signs and wonders recorded in the Book of Exodus which culminated in the catastrophe in the Red Sea can adequately account for the fact that the last kings of the Eighteenth Dynasty turned away from the priests of Amon and that Amenhotep the fourth finally revolted openly against them and their futile practices.

An Egyptian inscription exists in which Amenhotep is made to say, speaking of his father and grandfather by their "personal names," Nebmaara and Menkhephura, "The words of the priests more evil are they than those things which King Nebmaara heard, more evil are they than those things which Menkhephura heard." (Weigall, 100.)

The strongest proof that Amenhotep's religion was that of the Hebrews is the effect it had upon his actions.

The God of the Hebrews had forbidden any other gods ! Amenhotep tried to abolish the idolatry of Egypt ; closed the temples, turned his back upon the powerful priests and retired to Tel-el-Amarna where he built a new capital city, in which to institute the worship of one God.

The God of the Hebrews had promised that Palestine should belong to the Israelites. Amenhotep withdrew his troops and allowed the Israelites to conquer Palestine.

The God of the Hebrews had announced through Noah that the Canaanites were to be servants unto Shem's descendants. Amenhotep allowed the Israelites, who were Shem's descendants, to make slaves of the Canaanites and to draw from them the revenues which had once been his !

CHAPTER III

THE PROBLEM OF THE "AMORITES"

ACCORDING to Major Conder's and other writers' interpretations of the Amarna Tablets, Amenhotep's behaviour was extraordinarily inconsistent, for according to them, while he allowed the Israelites to conquer Southern Palestine he allowed Amorites to conquer Northern Palestine, that is to say Phoenicia. Major Conder writes: "The Amorites conquered all Phoenicia and besieged Tyre" (p. 5). ••

The Amorites, according to the tenth chapter of Genesis were one branch of the Canaanites, they were among the people whom the Israelites had been commanded to drive out or destroy.

Amenhotep's religion and consequent sympathy with the Israelites can well explain his allowing Joshua to conquer Palestine but that he should have allowed his Canaanite subjects to destroy his important seaport cities in Phoenicia can have no explanation. The Amorites, although the Tablets are supposed to show them attacking Tyre were, according to the Bible, fighting under the King of Tyre against Joshua's army (Joshua ix. 3).

At first sight there seems to be good grounds for Major Conder's theory, although it suggests a most improbable situation namely that the Canaanites, regardless of their common danger from the invading Israelites were fighting among themselves, for the following sentences prove that people *called* Amorites or the "sons of Abdasherah" and who are said to have come from "the Land of the Amorites" were conquering Phoenicia.

Abdasherah was (the letters show) the "Amorite leader" as Major Conder calls him (p. 9).

Ribaddi, the ruler of a Phoenician city writes to Amenhotep: "All who are in the Land of the Amorites have gathered and I am to be attacked." (Conder, p. 51.)

He writes again: "Who is Abdasherah? A slave, a dog, but send reinforcements!" (p. 66) and "But Abdasherah has conquered beyond the Land of the Amorites; also since the time of your father the city of Sidon has submitted to the occupation by his allies. The lands are for the men of blood (Haber) so now there is none who is a friend to me. Let the king regard the message of his servant" (p. 82).

The Canaanite rulers seem puzzled by the state of affairs; one of them writes to Amenhotep "the sons of Abdasherah, the slave dog, have pretended that the cities of the government of the king are given to them. Our cities. Will you not fortify your city? I am sincere but the covenant is mocked and no soldiers are heard of" (p. 72).

The Canaanitish rulers were perhaps not more puzzled than the translators have been. Professor Petrie remarks that, at that time "the politics were complex" (p. 63).

The Amarna Tablets throw light upon this puzzling situation, although a bewildering light it seems upon the surface, to be; so much so that the translators may have been blinded by it. The astonishing fact disclosed by the Tablets being that the people called Amorites who were conquering Phœnicia were being helped by the Haber. As the Haber are admitted to be the Israelites when attacking other parts of Palestine they must have been Israelites when attacking Phœnicia.

In this case it looks as if the Israelites, although they were attacking the Canaanites of some parts of Palestine had made an alliance with the Canaanites who were attacking Phœnicia.

No wonder Professor Petrie says that the politics in Palestine were "complex at that time."

The Amarna Tablets leave no doubt about it. The Haber and people called Amorites (Amurri) were both attacking Phœnicia.

The following sentences prove this. A Phœnician ruler

writes (p. 78) : " The Haberi take possession of all lands ; all lands fall away to the Haberi." Professor Petrie gives another letter from the ruler of Gebal, who writes : " Abdasherah has collected the Haberi against Shigata and Ambi ; your fortress is now in the power of the Haberi " (p. 90).

Abdasherah, who is said to have " collected " the Haberi was, as we have seen, the leader of the Amorites. He must then have commanded both the Haberi and the Amorites.

This strange alliance of Amorites and Haberi (which I hope to explain later) helps to show, at least, why Amenhotep allowed the " Amorites " to conquer Phœnicia while he allowed the Haberi to conquer the rest of Palestine. If, as this letter shows, the Amorites of the Tablets and the Haberi were allies, Amenhotep could not well have allowed the Haberi to conquer Phœnicia without allowing the Amorites to do so too !

Failing to solve the problem of this unnatural alliance, Major Conder and Professor Petrie apparently try to explain away the Haberi who were helping the Amorites to conquer Phœnicia. Unluckily for the success of their explanations—they differ.

Professor Petrie says (p. 65) that the Haberi mentioned upon the Tablets cannot have been the Israelites, although (he says) some people believe they were, because according to " all accounts " the Israelites attacked in the South of Palestine and the Haberi of the Tablets attacked in the North.

Major Conder says the exact opposite ; namely that the Haberi did not attack in the North of Palestine ; that they only attacked in the South. He writes : " The Haberi are never mentioned except in the South, near Jerusalem " (p. 141).

Their opinions disagree again about the word Haberi. Professor Petrie says that that word cannot mean " Hebrews," that it must mean " confederates," he gives no linguistic reason for this opinion, which is shared by Professor Sayce. (Petrie, p. 65.)

Major Conder says, on the contrary, that on linguistic grounds the word, " Haberi " cannot mean " confederates " as Professor Petrie tells us it does. As we have seen, philologists recognise the identity of the words Haberi and Hebrews.

The translators not only unintentionally contradict one another; each of them contradicts himself.

After saying that the Haberi attacked in the North (p. 64) Professor Petrie says that they are only mentioned in the letters from the King of Jerusalem, a city in the South of Palestine (p. 65). At the same time he publishes letters from several kings of Northern cities, all mentioning the Haberi.

Major Conder (p. 141) says that the Haberi are sometimes called the people of the blood or tribes of the Haberi! Because of which apparently, he changes the words Ameluti Saga which are rendered Haberi by other translators, into the expression "men of blood" in the Phœnician letters, thus it almost seems trying to get rid of the problem of the Haberi-Amorite alliance.

Although neither Professor Petrie nor Major Conder deals successfully with that problem it can, I firmly believe, be successfully dealt with. Although the word Haberi cannot be altered the word Amorite can be altered.

CHAPTER IV

THE KEY TO THE PROBLEM

As we have seen, the Canaanites themselves were puzzled! The personality of Abdasherah, the Amorite leader seems to have mystified them!

The ruler of a Phoenician city writes to Amenhotep: "Who is this Abdasherah? A slave, a dog, and shall the king's land be smitten by him?" (Conder, p. 66.)

So far as the Amarna Tablets go Abdasherah remains a mystery; seemingly shown by some letters to be a Hebrew, and by others, an Amorite. To solve the mystery of him and his Hebrew allies we must try to find out where he came from.

To that Major Conder gives us an involuntary clue by publishing sentences from a Phoenician ruler who writes: "All who are in the Land of the Amorites have gathered, I am to be attacked" (p. 51). "Mightily fighting the sons of Abdasherah have striven in the Land of the Amorites" (p. 62) and "You know not the Land of the Amorites" (p. 77). "You have been brought low before the Land of the Amorites" (p. 77). Again speaking of certain Egyptian officials he says: "Lo, may the Land of the Amorites become their conquest" (p. 74).

From these sentences we gather that there was some country called the Land of the Amorites which was not tributary to the King of Egypt as all Palestine is known to have been, for he is told that he knew not the Land of the Amorites and that he had been brought low before it. Its inhabitants must have been powerful and warlike to bring the King of Egypt low.

Professor Petrie and Major Conder have evidently seen that such a country existed outside Palestine; both have placed it on their maps somewhere between Amenhotep's possessions

in Northern Palestine and those of his uncle and father-in-law in Syria. It seems unlikely that a powerful warlike people could have existed between those two kingdoms.

Naturally the Amarna Tablets do not explain where the Land of the Amorites was; the king of Egypt required no explanation. Our only hope of learning more about it is by referring to the Bible, those "Hebrew Records" which the *Times History* says "are not paid much attention to nowadays."

The Bible tells us where the Land of the Amorites was and why the Israelites came into Palestine from there (Numbers xxi. 21). When the children of Israel (the Haberi of the Tablets) led by Moses, came out of the desert they found that, to reach the Promised Land they had to pass through the Land of the Amorites. "And Israel sent messengers unto Sihon, King of the Amorites saying, Let me pass through thy Land; we will not drink of the waters of the well; we will go along by the king's highway until we be past thy border. And Sihon would not suffer Israel to pass through his border; but Sihon gathered all his people together and went out against Israel into the wilderness and fought against Israel. And Israel smote him with the sword and possessed his land . . . and Israel dwelt in all the cities of the Amorites. Thus Israel dwelt in the Land of the Amorites."

But only for a short time, Palestine was their goal as they all knew! The three tribes of Reuben, Gad and half the tribe of Manasseh however, asked Moses to allow them to settle in the Land of the Amorites (Numbers xxxii. 6): "And Moses said . . . Shall your brethren go to war and shall ye sit here? They answered him We will build sheep folds for our cattle and cities for our little ones; but we ourselves will go armed before the children of Israel until we have brought them into their place."

Moses agreed to this and in the fourth chapter of Joshua we read how the "children of Reuben and the children of Gad and half the tribe of Manasseh passed over armed before the children of Israel as Moses spoke unto them."

It was from the Land of the Amorites therefore that (according to the Bible) the Israelites crossed the Jordan to

conquer Palestine. Because of which the Canaanites living on the sea coast of Palestine seem to have sometimes called them the men from the Land of the Amorites or the Amorites.

Their doing this agrees with other historical facts; the strange tribes introduced into Samaria by the Assyrian king in the eighth century before Christ to replace the Israelites whom he had led into captivity in Assyria were afterwards called Samaritans (2 Kings xvii. 24). The exiled Israelites themselves are now known to have been called Medes, Persians and Manda, when, later on, they took possession of lands which had belonged to peoples of those names (Marchant, *Monumental Facts*, etc.). The Slavonic tribes who, according to the German, Professor Sievers (*Enc. Britt.*, Ed. 10, 11) took possession of the lands left vacant by the Saxons who came to Britain took the name of Saxon, and the British who settled in America are called Americans as were the Indians who inhabited that country before them. In the same way, the Israelites who conquered Phœnicia were called Amorites by the Canaanites who inhabited that land. The very fact that they were fighting with people called Haberi and Sagas against the Canaanites is enough to prove that those "Amorites" mentioned upon the Tablets were Israelites. While, therefore, Major Conder tells us that "The Amorites conquered all Phœnicia and besieged Tyre" (p. 5). I maintain that it was the Israelites who conquered Phœnicia and besieged Tyre. To satisfy ourselves, however, that they conquered all Phœnicia and became the wonderful people known as Phœnicians we must prove that they not only "besieged Tyre" but took it, and also took Sidon. Unless they had taken those two Canaanite strongholds they could never have settled in Phœnicia at all.

CHAPTER V

SIDON CONQUERED BY HEBREWS

THE *Cambridge Bible Commentary* says that after Joshua's death the Israelites grew slothful and never conquered Tyre and Sidon (p. 190).

But what about Joshua himself? Surely if it was anybody's business to see that the Israelites conquered those cities it was Joshua's. It had been decreed to Moses (Numbers xxxiv.) that the western border of the Israelites' possessions in Palestine was to be the Great (or Mediterranean) Sea. Would not Joshua, in order to fulfil that decree have made every effort to conquer the Phœnician cities which lay upon the coast of that sea?

According to the Book of Joshua the cities of Sidon and Tyre were allotted to the tribe of Asher by Joshua before his death. Had Joshua left those cities in the hands of the Canaanites his allotment of them to the tribe of Asher would indeed have been a mockery.

Both the Authorised and Revised Versions of the Bible give the impression that the Israelites never conquered Tyre and Sidon, but if the translators of those versions of the Bible had had the Amarna Tablets to refer to they might not have done so.

It was not till after the Revised Version of the Bible was published that the Amarna Tablets were discovered.

In the eleventh chapter of the Book of Joshua we read that the Israelites chased the army of the Northern Canaanites up to the city of Sidon and there utterly destroyed it. That army represented the last of the Canaanites. Dean Stanley sums up the situation in his lectures (p. 259) by saying

"As the British chiefs were driven to the Lands End of England before the advance of the Saxons, so at this Lands End of Palestine were gathered for this last struggle"—the remaining Canaanites.

According to both versions of the Bible, Joshua turned back after destroying the Canaanites before Sidon and burnt an inland city called Hazor. As nothing is said about Joshua attacking Sidon, Bible commentators have inferred that he did not conquer that city and that it never belonged to the Israelites.

12001.

But can we believe that the Israelites, flushed with their victory over the Canaanites could have tamely turned away from that Canaanite stronghold which would always have threatened their position in Palestine?

Joshua's tactics have been compared with those of the greatest modern commanders; which of those commanders would have acted as Joshua is believed to have done with regard to Tyre and Sidon?

The Amarna Tablets vindicate Joshua's conduct as regards Sidon by showing that the city was conquered by Hebrews.

Zimrida, ruler of Sidon, writes to Amenhotep: "Behold all my cities which the king has given into my hands have fallen into the hands of the Hebrews." This sentence is given by Dr. Kelly Cheyne (*Enc. Britt.*, Ed. II., Vol. 5, p. 141).

That Sidon was the last of Zimrida's cities to fall is shown by a letter published by Professor Petrie (p. 74) as follows: "Zimrida to king, Zimrida is prince of Ziduna (Sidon) which is safe; but his other cities have fallen to the Khaberi and he asks for troops and succour."

Ribaddi, the ruler of Gebal, tells Amenhotep how Zimrida of Sidon had deserted to the Amorites whose leader (as we have seen) was Abdasherah; the ruler writes that if he had agreed with Abdasherah as Zimrida of Zidon had done he would have been safe (p. 78). Professor Petrie remarks that this letter shows that Sidon was lost as its ruler Zimrida had gone over to the enemy.

Before Zidon was taken Zimrida evidently made some resistance; he writes to Amenhotep: "Lo, the city of Sidon

has gathered; I am gathering O king all who are faithful to my hands. . . . Know O king mighty has been the battle against me . . . the greatest of the fortresses desert to the enemy which has gone well for the men of blood [Haber] and they are gaining them from my hands and my destruction is before me." (Conder, p. 100.)

Another letter from Tyre tells of some evidently important person flying from Sidon to, as it is expressed, "escape from slavery." (C., p. 108.) This agrees with the Bible (R.V. Margin) which tells us that the surviving Canaanites were made to do "task work" by the Israelites. The fugitive's name is given as Zimridi—he is thought to have been the ruler Zimrida himself. He is said to have fled to Irib, which Major Conder thinks was in the Lebanon (p. 108). That some of the Canaanites escaped to the mountains agrees with the thirteenth chapter of Joshua, where "Sidonians" are said to be still existing in what is called the "Hill country" shortly before Joshua's death.

The ruler of Gebal makes it quite clear that Sidon was taken by the Hebrews (C., p. 82, also Winckler, p. 275). He writes to Amenhotep "The city of Sidon and the city of Beirut the sons of Abdasherah have silenced, they fought for the king but the city of Beirut and the city of Sidon are not the king's. We sent a Paka . . . he did not desert his duty to you but she has rebelled to your face for it was permitted by the free men; the men of blood (Haber) have seized the city."

The city whose freemen were on the side of the enemy was (as Major Conder remarks) Sidon.

The ruler of Gebal continues his letter: "Abdasherah has conquered beyond the Land of the Amorites; the city of Sidon has submitted to the occupation of his allies; the lands are for the Haber so now there is none who is a friend to me."

Abdasherah was quite probably the Canaanites' name for Joshua. Who Abdasherah's allies were is an interesting question. They may have been a contingent of the Israelites from the Land of the Amorites who instead of crossing the Jordan with Joshua's army had attacked Phœnicia from the north.

The Land of Bashan which the Israelites had conquered (Joshua xiii. 12) would have made a strong military base for it was almost opposite Sidon on the east side of the River Jordan.

On the other hand they may even more probably have been the Hebrew or Aramean army of Dusratta, Amenhotep's uncle and father-in-law, the king of Mitanni in Northern Syria ; the Tablets show that he was fighting in alliance with the Israelities against the Canaanites (p. 68).

In one letter Ribaddi says that Abdasherah's sons or followers were "creatures of the King of Mitanni" (Winckler, p. 189). In another letter he says that one of Abdasherah's sons was the King of Mitanni ; again Ribaddi writes as if Abdasherah himself was the King of Mitanni he says : "Who is Abdasherah ? the King of Mitanni and Kassi is he who takes the king's lands for himself." (*Knudtzon*, p. 381.)

In another letter Ribbaddi undoubtedly gives the impression that Abdasherah was Joshua ; he writes to Amenhotep : "Who is Abdasherah ? the slave, the dog, who set him up ? Why, the mighty Saga man set him up."

As the expression "Saga man" also meant "Hebrew man," the "Mighty Saga man" sounds like Moses, and the man "set up" by Moses was, of course, Joshua !

These conflicting statements show that to Ribaddi Abdasherah was a mystery and a mystery as experts admit (*K.*, p. 38) he remains. His identity is comparatively unimportant ; but that the name Abdasherah (Abdiasirta as Winckler gives the name) represented the leader of the Hebrews to the minds of the Canaanites of Phoenicia is certain.

That the Hebrews attacked from two different directions is shown by another letter ; a ruler writes : "Part of the Haberi are from the land Amuzzi and part from the land of Hubi." (*Conder*, p. 18.) Perhaps it was Dusratta, King of Mitanni who handed over Sidon to Joshua after the battle in front of that city in which Joshua destroyed the Canaanitish army.

However that may be and whoever the Hebrews were who took Sidon, the only thing that really matters is, they took it, from the Canaanites of whom they made slaves.

Which explains the words (Judges i. 31), "Asher drove not out the inhabitants of . . . Sidon . . . but the Asherites dwelt among the Canaanites, the inhabitants of the land for they did not drive them out."

Could there have been any question of the Asherites driving out the inhabitants of Sidon unless the Israelites had conquered that city?

CHAPTER VI

TYRE DESTROYED BY JOSHUA

THE important question is now, what do the Tablets say about Tyre which was probably an even stronger Canaanite fortress than Sidon? No account of the fall of Tyre has been found, as far as I know, among the Amarna Tablets, considering that hundreds of them have been destroyed since their excavation we can hardly hope for a complete history of the conquest of Phoenicia!

The Tablets do show, however, that Tyre was being attacked and overcome by Hebrews, which, combined with certain other evidence, proves to my mind that it also fell to the Israelites.

The Egyptian official of Tyre writes to Amenhotep, "I watch the city of Tyre, the handmaid of the king my lord . . . is not the king nourished by his city of Tyre? Lo, if I am destroyed the king will be destroyed."

The Paka evidently considered Tyre almost necessary to Amenhotep; he continues: "Know O king, desolation has remained with me, with the Paka in the city of Tyre . . . there is no water or wood for us and alas, there is no one remaining to stand up for me." (Conder, p. 108.)

The Paka then says that the chief of the Amorites is destroying him; and makes it clear that the Amorites came from Sidon which city he also shows had been taken by Hebrews (Petrie, p. 95).

He says that the ruler of Sidon is collecting ships, chariots and soldiers to seize Tyre, he writes again that Tyre is rebelling and that the ruler of Sidon is taking away his people, he says: "All will break out, let the king give countenance to his servant and let him leap forth to go out as a conqueror." (C., p. 107.) Tyre was in a sorry plight, attacked by sea and

land and rebellion within her gates! Can we believe that Joshua did not seize the opportunity of destroying the danger spot which Tyre would have always been to the Israelites?

Sentences from a letter written by Ribaddi suggest that the Paka perished in Tyre (Petrie, p. 95). He writes: "Behold Tyre has acted rebelliously . . . verily they killed their commander and also my sister and her sons! I had sent them to Tyre for fear of Abdasherah . . . verily I have written thus to the palace but my requests have not been carried out nor listened to." (Winckler, p. 153.) Yet, according to both the Authorised and Revised versions of the Bible Joshua never even tried to conquer Tyre!

Instead of doing so he attacked and burnt an inland city called Hāzor which could not have been so important as Tyre, especially if only eleven miles from Tyre as both Professor Petrie and Major Conder say it was (p. 174) for the Tablets and the Bible show that Tyre was chief of the cities in her neighbourhood.

If the translators of those versions of the Bible could have known what the Tablets say about Tyre they would surely have done what another translator has done, given Tyre as the city burnt down by Joshua instead of Hāzor!

Why Ferrer Fenton does this in his version of the Bible only as great an oriental scholar as he was could explain; considering that the letters Z Ō R, the last letters in Hāzor, are the Hebrew name for Tyre (meaning a rock) and that Hāzor or Khāzor simply means the rock, Ha or Kha being the definite article the, there may easily have been a mistake. Upon the Amarna Tablets Tyre seems to be called Tsurri and Khazura.

Whatever Ferrer Fenton's reasons may have been for changing the name Hāzor to Tyre, the fact that Tyre is described in the Amarna letters as being attacked and overcome by Hebrews leaves little doubt that he was right in doing so.

Judging by the Egyptian Paka's account of the destruction going on in Tyre, Joshua cannot have found much to

do when he arrived before that city except to burn it to the ground, which he did, according to Ferrer Fenton's version of the Bible; his reason being that, as we read in the eleventh chapter of Joshua, Tyre was the "head of kingdoms," or as Ferrer Fenton more convincingly translates it "head of chiefdoms."

The Amarna Tablets support this description of Tyre; the Paka writes: "My plain is my land over against my highlands over against the plain of my cities" (C., p. 103) and "the city Sarbitu is to be guarded by the city of Tyre."

Besides which Ribaddi writes (Winckler, p. 155): "Now the territory of Tyre is certainly not the territory of a feudal prince . . . it is in the same condition as the territory of Ugarit." Ugarit is supposed to have been an independent state of Syria (Petrie, p. 184).

In Ferrer Fenton's version it is, of course, Jabin, king of Tyre, not Jabin, king of Hazor, who calls out other Canaanite chiefs to fight against the Israelites. That Jabin led that Canaanite army which was destroyed before Sidon is probably why the Egyptian Paka writes to Amenhotep: "Lo, destruction has remained with me, with the Paka in the city of Tyre and alas, there is none to stand up for me." (C., p. 108.) Perhaps the Paka had heard of king Jabin's death in battle. On the Amarna Tablets, according to Major Conder (p. 112), Jabin writes, evidently just before leading his soldiers against Joshua, he says: "To the king my lord thus says Jabin (Ibaenu), chief of the city of Khazura . . . Lo, I am guarding the fortresses of the king my lord . . . and I am departing . . . lo, they come. . . ." The letter is broken but ends with the suggestive words, "Moreover, behold . . . and my place . . . with soldiers."

May not those broken sentences tell the tale of king Jabin's going forth to war?

Accepting these conclusions we have a reasonable account of the conquest of Palestine; we can reject the translator's accounts of the civil war going on in Phœnicia between tribes of Canaanites while the Israelites were on their borders, conquering the rest of Palestine.

We can ignore such stories as that told by a German professor and reproduced in our *Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges*, in which he says that the Israelites never conquered Phœnicia, that (in his own words) "they dwelt among the Canaanites and though not nominally a subject people they were so thoroughly checked in their plans of conquest and dashed their strength so uselessly against the strong rock of Canaanite power that in the shock of failure they settled down side by side with the Canaanites."

Would such a thing be possible in any age?

Can we imagine the Germans before Paris, checked in their plan of conquest "settling down side by side" with the French? Yet this is what we are taught in our schools about the conquest of Phœnicia.

Accepting as proved by the Amarna Tablets that Phœnicia as well as the other parts of Palestine was conquered by the Israelites we see that Amenhotep's behaviour was not due as some Egyptologists think it was to the king's "incredible apathy and ignorance of what was going on in Palestine," but that Amenhotep only did what as a believer in the God of the Hebrews he was bound to do, he allowed the Israelites to take possession of the land which had been promised to them.

Accepting this theory we need not doubt the inspired genius of Joshua's leadership! It had been decreed that the western border of the Israelites' possessions should be the Mediterranean Sea. Joshua fulfilled that decree by conquering Phœnicia.

Believing that Joshua destroyed Tyre we can acquit the Jewish historian Josephus of the anachronism of which he has been thought guilty in saying that Tyre was built only two hundred years before Solomon's temple was built; although we learn in the Book of Joshua that Tyre was an important city at least fifty years before the time at which Josephus says it was built. It was evidently the rebuilding of Tyre by the tribe of Asher after its destruction by Joshua to which Josephus refers.

We see too, that the writer of the eightieth Psalm did not exaggerate when he described the vine, by which he

typified the Israelites, as filling the Land of Palestine when transplanted there from Egypt and as sending out its branches into the sea ; neither of which could the Israelites have been said to have done if they had not conquered Phoenicia.

We can better understand Ezekiel's words to Tyre (xxviii. 15) "Thou wast perfect in thy ways from the day thou wast created." How could those words have been addressed to a city built by Canaanites ? It must have been the new city of Tyre, built presumably by the tribe of Asher, to which Ezekiel refers.

That the tribe of Asher possessed Tyre, "The crowning city" whose "merchants were princes," as Isaiah describes Tyre, shows the fulfilment of a strange prophecy made by Jacob (Gen. xlix. 20). After promising Judah the sceptre, emblem of perpetual royalty, Jacob promised Asher "royal dainties," otherwise translated "royal pleasures." In the time of Hiram, king of Tyre, whose fleets ploughed the sea with that of King Solomon, bringing back the produce of many lands, that promise made to Asher by Jacob was fulfilled

CHAPTER VII

THE HABERI IN THE ISLES OF THE WEST

THIS interpretation of the Amarna Tablets, showing that Israelites and not Amorites conquered Phœnicia in the reign of Amenhotep the fourth, of Egypt, and that therefore the Phœnicians of later times were Israelites, contradicts modern writers who, undoubtedly influenced by the translators' interpretation of the Tablets, say that the Phœnicians were Canaanites (*Enc. Britt.*, Vol. 21, p. 449., Ed. II). The general opinion of the origin of the Phœnicians is expressed by Bosworth Smith in his *History of Carthage*, which was a Phœnician colony. He writes: "It was lucky for the civilisation of the ancient world that the Israelites did not destroy the Canaanites as they were commanded to do for that 'accursed race' became the enterprising mariners and dauntless colonisers of the world."

The expression "accursed race" evidently refers sarcastically to Noah's prophecy, "Cursed be Canaan, a servant of servants shall he be." As there was nothing servile about the Phœnicians whom Bosworth Smith believed to have been Canaan's descendants he thought that Noah's prophecy had failed. As, however, the Tablets show that Israelites and not Canaanites conquered Phœnicia we see that it was the Israelites who became the "enterprising mariners and dauntless colonizers," the "men peerlesse in peace and warre," as the Phœnicians are described by the second century historian Pomponius Mela (*Times History*, Vol. 2, p. 359), and Noah's prophecy did not fail! For to the Israelites' ancestor Shem, he had prophesied a ruling race and to the ancestor of the subjugated Canaanites, a race of slaves.

According to my interpretation of the Amarna Tablets the sixteenth century historian Camden was nearer the mark than our modern writers, for he wrote that the Phœnicians who came to Britain, making settlements in these islands were "Jews, with Tyrians and Sidonians." If he had said that they were Asherites and Danites instead of saying that they were Jews, he would, I believe, have been quite right for the tribes of Asher and Dan were the seafaring tribes of Israel.

The "Tyrians and Sidonians" who came with the "Jews" to Britain were probably the Canaanitish slaves of the Israelites; That they were "put to task work" here as they had been in Palestine and that their descendants became the serfs of the ancient feudal system seems probable!

A remarkable reason for the coming to Britain of the people he calls "Jews" is given by Camden; he says that they came because they had understood that the future empire of the world would be in the West. Several verses in the Bible throw light upon that statement (Isaiah xli., Zech. x. 9, 1 Chron. xvii. 6, 10, 2 Sam. vii. 10, 11).

In the eleventh chapter of Isaiah we find the words, "The Lord shall set his hand again the second time to recover the remnant of his people . . . from . . . the islands of the sea."

The Hebrew word Yam for sea, also means West (Young's *Analyt. Conc.*). Taking the word Yam as West (which the translators of the Bible have done in the fourteenth verse of the same chapter) Camden's "Jews" may have gathered from that verse that their home was to be in the "Islands of the West" whence they would eventually return to Palestine.

Herodotus, the "Father of History" agrees with this reading of the Tablets; he says that according to the "most learned Persians" of his time (fifth century B.C.) the Phœnicians came from the Erythrean Sea; from which, as it included the Red Sea, the Israelites certainly may be said to have come. .

Nor are we quite without modern authority for believing that the Phœnicians were Hebrews. The German specialist in "Semitic" languages, Theodor Noldeke says: "It is a poor evasion to deny that the Phœnicians were genuine

Semites, since even our scanty sources of information suffice to show that in matters of religion which among Semites is of such supreme importance, they bore a close resemblance to the ancient Hebrews and Arameans." (*Enc. Britt.*, Ed. II., Vol. 24, p. 619.)

Anyone who accepts this reading of the Amarna Tablets may be glad to know that the Phœnicians who according to many writers made settlements in Britain and must therefore be counted among the ancestors of the British, were not, as has been thought, of the "Accursed race of Canaan" but were of the race of Shem and that, at least as far as their Phœnician ancestors go, the British have rightfully inherited nearly all the promises made to Shem's descendants Abraham, Isaac and Jacob.

To people who believe that the British are the literal descendants of the ancient Israelites and who have satisfactorily traced back to an Israelitish origin the other ruling tribes who settled in Britain this interpretation of the Amarna Tablets, showing that the Phœnicians were also Israelites, supplies a hitherto missing link in their chain of evidence.

CHAPTER VIII

THE SUPPOSED HITTITE EMPIRE

THE Amarna Tablets, in conjunction with the Bible, not only prove the true identity of the Phœnicians, but disprove the theory held by some archeologists that the Hittites, one of the seven tribes descended from Canaan, son of Ham, became a great people and that for many centuries a "Great Hittite Empire"—existed in the countries north and east of Palestine.

It is chiefly from monumental discoveries made in Asia Minor, Syria and Mesopotamia that the theory of the existence of a Hittite Empire has been evolved. One of its originators is Professor Sayce, who, in the year 1880, "proclaimed the fact that a great Hittite Empire extending from Kadesh to Smyrna had risen from the dead." (*Enc. Britt.*, Ed. 11, Vol. 13, "Hittites.")

That empire is said to have reached the zenith of its power about the time of the Conquest of Palestine by the Israelites, which, as is now known, took place during the reign of Amenhotep the fourth, of Egypt. The Amarna Tablets show that although a great empire did exist when and where archeologists say it did, it was ruled, not by Hittites but by Aramæans who, as we have seen, were the same race as the Hebrews (Hall, p. 400), and whose king was Dusratta of Mitanni. Dr. Isaac Taylor (*The Alphabet*) one of the supporters of the theory of the "Hittite empire" says: "They were one of the most powerful peoples of the primeval world. Their empire extended from the frontiers of Egypt to the shores of the Ægean. In almost every detail they correspond to the Hittites of the Bible."

Professor Brugsch says: "We believe we are falling into no error if we persevere in our opinion which recognises in these

people the same Kethites (Hittites) about whom Holy Scripture has so much to tell us." (*Egypt under the Pharaohs* p. 2.)

Another authority, Dr. Wright, in his *Empire of the Hittites* says: "In recent years Egypt and Assyria have been yielding up their secrets to modern research. The veil has begun to lift from dark continents of history. As soon as the key was found to the hieroglyphics of Egypt and the cuneiforms of Assyria, a mighty Hittite people began to emerge. They appeared chiefly as a nation of warriors in constant conflict with the great monarchies on their borders, but in almost every detail they correspond to the Hittites of the Bible."

On the contrary, those people do not correspond to the Hittites of the Bible.

This fact other writers have realised. In the *Times History* (Vol. 2, p. 391), we read that since, as it is now known, the Hittites became a great people, "the Bible Records must be faulty" in saying that they were the descendants of Heth, son of Canaan, and that the Israelites easily overcame them.

The desire to expose the fallacy of a theory which seems to confute the Bible Records has prompted my investigation of the grounds for the archeologist's theory of a Hittite empire. Only the gist of their arguments can be given in this book, but their conclusions are given and my reasons for disputing them. Believing that, in the Apostle Paul's words "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God," I take the Bible as my key to ancient history. In the ninth chapter of Genesis we learn that Canaan's race was to be a subjugated race. The Canaanites were to serve the descendants of Shem. Refusing therefore to believe that, even for a limited period the Hittites, who were Canaanites, could have possessed a great empire I have searched for and found what I consider convincing proof that the empire which existed in the countries north of Palestine during the Eighteenth Dynasty in Egypt was an Aramæan, not a Hittite empire.

The Aramæans, like the Hebrews, were descendants of Shem from whose son Aram they derived their name; while the Hebrews' name was derived from Eber who was Shem's great grandson. Where in the Bible (A.V.) the Hebrew patriarch,

Jacob, is described as a Syrian, the original word for Syrian is Arami (Deut. xxvi. 5). The Land of Syria was called Aram at one time and its inhabitants were called Aramæans.

Although the Hittites of the so-called Hittite empire are said to have been the same people as the Bible Hittites both the Bible and monumental inscriptions show that this could not have been the case.

Those Bible Hittites are proved by Egyptian inscriptions and also by the more reliable evidence of the Amarna Tablets to have been conquered by the first kings of the Eighteenth Dynasty and to have remained tributary subjects of Egypt until the reign of Amenhotep the fourth, the last authenticated king of the Eighteenth Dynasty, when they were conquered by the Israelites under Joshua. As it was during the Eighteenth Dynasty that the Hittites are supposed to have become a great empire they cannot have been the Hittites of the Bible.

In support of the theory of the Hittite empire it might be argued that there were Hittite kings or chiefs in Solomon's time and that in the time of the Prophet Elisha, "Hittite kings" were hired by the king of Israel to fight for him against his enemies (2 Kings x.). That only an independent race could have possessed those warrior kings is evident.

While those "Hittite kings" are claimed by Professor Sayce for his "Hittite empire," I maintain that they were Aramæans who for certain reasons to be explained later were called Hittites. Scholars have, because of the subjugated state of the Hittites in Palestine, as described in the Bible, doubted the existence at that time of Hittite kings and warriors, and the reliability of the Bible passages in which those kings are mentioned has been questioned. On the strength of his theory of a Hittite empire, to which he says those Hittite kings belonged, Professor Sayce defends those passages; he writes that "recent discoveries" which have revealed to him a "Hittite empire" have retorted the critic's objections upon himself. He says, "It is not the Biblical writer but the modern author who is now proved to have been unacquainted with the contemporaneous history of the time, the Hittites were a very real power." (*The Hittites*, p. 11.)

This explanation of the "Hittite chiefs or kings" mentioned in the Bible, namely, that they belonged to a powerful empire existing outside Palestine is undoubtedly the right one; but that that powerful empire was a Hittite empire is, in the light of Bible prophecy impossible.

Canaan's descendants were to serve the descendants of Shem, they were to be "servants of servants," a slave race. A great Hittite empire would have been utterly inconsistent with that prophecy. To vindicate the infallibility of Bible prophecy and the consistency of the Bible Records we must prove that the empire to which those Hittite kings belonged was not of the "accursed race" of Canaan but belonged to the chosen race of Shem.

Thanks to Professor Sayce's valuable discoveries my arguments to prove this are based on scientific facts; for they have shown him that there was, at least an element, of Aramæan in his "Hittite empire."

He remarks upon the "curious fact" that in the Assyrian inscriptions the name "Khatta or Hittite" and "Syrian or Aramæan" became synonymous (*Hittites*, p. 49). In other words that the names Hittite and Aramæan used in inscriptions described the same people. He illustrates this fact by an inscription of Shalmaneser, king of Assyria, which shows that either Aramæans and Hittites inhabited the same country or were the same people.

This "curious fact" the professor explains by saying that Hittites had at some time "imposed their yoke" upon Aramæans; because of which he says: "Hittite and Aramæan cities and tribes were intermingled together." He writes: "The Hittites had in short never been more than a conquering upper class in Syria . . . as time wore on the subject population [Aramæans presumably?] gained more and more upon them. Like all similar aristocracies they tended to die out or to be absorbed by the native population."

Upon this unbiassed evidence that a strong Aramæan element existed in the so-called Hittite empire I found my arguments to prove that that empire was Aramæan.

The true explanation of the confusion between the names

Hittite and Aramæan is, I maintain, judging by the Amarna letters, that instead of the Hittites having "imposed their yoke" upon Aramæans, the Aramæan king, Dusratta of Mitanni had shortly before the Conquest of Palestine by the Israelites taken possession of part of the Land of the Hittites by permission of the Egyptian king (his brother-in-law) and had called himself the "chief of the Hittites," because of which he is sometimes called upon the Tablets, "the King of the Land of the Hittites," while his soldiers are called the Hittites (Khatti) the men of the Land of the Hittites. That the name Hittite clung for generations to the Aramæans seems to be the best explanation of the fact that the words Hittite and Aramæan were used synonymously in monumental inscriptions and also in the Bible.

As we have seen, Professor Sayce unintentionally supports my theory of an Aramæan empire by showing that a strong Aramæan element existed in that empire although (according to him) it was ruled by Hittites.

Dr. Hall, who believes in the "Hittite empire," also gives involuntary support to my theory by showing that (at least in Syria) the Aramæans overcame the Hittites about the time of the Conquest of Palestine by the Israelites. He writes: "Damascus became the centre of an Aramæan state and gradually . . . the Amorites and Hittites of the Orontes Valley and Northern Syria were swamped or absorbed and driven out by the steady pressure of the Aramæans" (p. 400). This he says took place about the time of the revolution in Amenhotep the fourth's reign, "when," he adds, "in all probability the Hebrew invasion of Palestine also took place" (p. 400).

According to this, the Hittites of Solomon's reign, instead of being a "very real power" had been, at any rate in some districts, swamped or absorbed and driven out by Aramæans.

To this evidence upon my side, Major Conder adds by showing that the Aramæans who, as Dr. Hall tells us, conquered Damascus, were led by Dusratta of Mitanni (Conder, p. 5).

Dr. Hall however ignores Dusratta's conquest of Damascus

and tells us that Dusratta was conquered about that time (p. 400) by a great Hittite king named Subbiluliuma, who reigned over the so-called Hittite empire.

This belief which is shared by other writers is founded upon certain cuneiform inscriptions which we shall examine later ; those inscriptions are of a later date and of a less reliable character.

By the following arguments I hope to show that Professor Sayce's " Hittite empire " was an Aramæan empire ruled over by Dusratta of Mitanni and that Dr. Hall's great Hittite, Subbiluliuma did not exist at all.

CHAPTER IX

DUSRATTA AND HIS EMPIRE

My first argument is that Dusratta was so great a king, and ruled over so extensive an empire, that no other powerful people antagonistic to him could have existed in the same part of the world where the "Hittite empire" is supposed to have flourished.

The extent of Dusratta's empire is proved by his titles!

He always calls himself the king of Mitanni, which country is thought to have been Mesopotamia. (Petrie, *Syria and Egypt*, p. 177.)

As King of Mesopotamia alone Dusratta must have been rich and powerful, for, with its ancient system of canals, that country was probably at that time the most fertile in the world.

Dr. Hall says that Dusratta ruled Assyria and perhaps Babylon as well (p. 197).

Another of Dusratta's titles was King of Armenia (Conder, p. 30), the name of which country was evidently derived from the name Aram (Shem's son) as was that of Syria of which he was also king (*Enc. Britt.*, Ed. 11, Vol. 13, "Hittites"). He is sometimes called the King of Naharaim or Narima (the Aram Naharaim of the Bible, Syria of the two rivers), another name for Mesopotamia according to Professor Sayce (*The Hittites*, p. 20). The name Nahrima (Naharaim) was according to Professor Weber the Egyptian designation for Mitanni (Knudtzon, p. 1072.)

Dusratta is also called the King of Kassi (K., p. 1101), which country was Cappadocia in Asia Minor (Sayce "Hittite inscriptions" and is also said to have ruled over Anatolians, people of Asia Minor (Hall, p. 230). There is evidence which

we shall notice later that he reigned in Cilicia. Asia Minor was evidently largely, if not entirely, ruled by Dusratta.

He is sometimes called the king of the Minnyans, the people who according to Major Conder were descended from the Hyksos or Shepherd kings who had conquered Egypt many centuries before and who are called Men or Menti upon the Egyptian monuments (C., p. 174). The Land of the Minnyans was Southern Armenia (C., p. 7). Its inhabitants were, Major Conder thinks, the Minni mentioned in the fifty-fifth chapter of Jeremiah where the kingdoms of Minni and Ararat are connected. As Ararat is situated in Armenia whose king (Dusratta) called himself the king of the Minnyans this seems evident.

Dusratta is also called the King of the "Land of Hanigalbat" or "Khanirabbe," which Major Conder thinks meant "the Land of the great khan or prince." As Shem, Aram, Eber and Abraham seem to have lived in Dusratta's land and probably Noah as well, that name may have come from one or more of those patriarchs; in the twenty-third chapter of Genesis, Abraham is called "a mighty prince."

These different titles alone prove that Dusratta's empire was such that a rival power could hardly have fought its way to greatness in the same part of the world; and his alliance with the Egyptian kings makes it impossible that the Hittites, who were their subjects, could have done so.

That Dusratta and the Egyptian king, Amenhotep the third, were firm allies is proved by the fact that, after he had conquered a Hittite army, brought against him by a rebellious subject of his own, Dusratta was allowed by the Egyptian king to take possession of some of the Hittite cities in the North of Palestine which, up to then, had been governed by the Egyptians (A.T., p. 179). One of Dusratta's letters shows that the Hittite cities he asks for were boundary cities; he probably wanted to insure his country from further Hittite attacks (Knudtzon, p. 1052).

The perfect understanding between Dusratta and Amenhotep the third, is shown by the letter (A.T., p. 174) in which Dusratta, perhaps playfully, calls himself in writing to

Amenhotep, "the chief of the power of the Land of the Hittites" although the Hittites had been for several generations subjects of the Egyptian kings.

Dusratta did not rule over all the Hittites for, according to the Bible, a Hittite army fought against the Israelites before Sidon while Dusratta himself, as the Tablets prove, fought on the side of the Israelites against the Canaanites. It was probably he, as we have seen, who handed over Sidon to Joshua after the battle in front of that city!

Major Conder writes about Dusratta: "He was a younger man than Amenophis (Amenhotep the third) his sister married the said King of Egypt . . . his daughter Tadukhipa married Amenophis the fourth and there were friendly relations between Egypt and Mitanni in the latter as in the former reign." (A. T., p. 95.)

As the kings of the Eighteenth Dynasty were partly or entirely descended from the Hyksos rulers there were racial ties between the kings of Mitanni and Egypt as well as ties of marriage, for Dusratta was also a descendant of Hyksos kings. That Dusratta and his father considered themselves equal or even superior to the Egyptian kings is shown by the following letter, from which we see how many times Egyptian kings had to ask for Mitannian princesses before they were given to them in marriage.

Dusratta writes to Amenhotep the fourth: "The father of Amenophis the third sent to Sitatama my grandfather and . . . a daughter. He sent to my grandfather five or six times and he was not given her when he sent . . . and at length he was given her. Amenophis the third, your father sent (Major Conder suggests "humbly"!) to Sutarna my father . . . and so for my father's daughter my own sister his heart was desirous and five or six times he sent, at length he was given her." (Conder, p. 177.)

In other letters, translated by Professor Knudtzon, Dusratta bargains for at least six months with Amenhotep the third, before sending his daughter Tadukhipa to Egypt to marry Amenhotep the fourth, although it is promised that she shall be "the Queen of Egypt" (K., p. 147). When Dusratta's sister

went to Egypt to marry Amenhotep the third, she had three hundred and seventeen ladies in her train and inventories have been found among the Amarna Tablets showing what elaborate outfits the Mitannian princesses took with them into Egypt.

Tadukhipa's inventory is labelled, "These are the things carried by the female slaves, all those things which Dusratta, King of Mitanni gave to Amenophis the third, his brother; his kinsman, when he sent his daughter, Tadukhipa to the land of Egypt to Amenophis the third for marriage, he gave all these that day." (Conder, p. 188.)

Amongst Tadukhipa's dowry were horses, a chariot and harness plaited with gold and silver and adorned with precious stones, camel litters, a saddle adorned with golden eagles, variegated garments worked with gold, embroidered zones and shawls, necklaces and bracelets of solid gold, one bracelet of iron gilt, carved boxes to hold treasures, gems of "stones of great light" which Major Conder thinks may have been diamonds (p. 189), a necklace of one hundred and twenty gems set in gold, including "green stones" probably emeralds, objects of jade, bronze ornaments for horses and one umbrella adorned with gold.

Major Conder who gives this list remarks (p. 190): "The inventories of Tadukhipa's marriage outfit show how far advanced was the civilisation of Western Asia in the fourteenth century B.C., and indicate not only the native wealth of gold and silver, copper and bronze from Asia Minor and the Caucasus, but also a trade which brought jade from central Asia. The art of the age is similar to that of the objects found at Troy and Mycenæ."

The wreath that Dusratta says he is sending to Amenhotep the third was according to Knudtzon's translation (p. 155), "a costly wreath of roses made of beautiful lazur-stein (lapis lazuli?) and of gold."

It was probably like the exquisite wreaths found in Hyksos tombs in Egypt and illustrated in the *Encyclopædia Britannica* (Ed. 11, Vol. 15, p. 307) the designs of which rival those of the modern Parisian jewelry.

Dusratta shows the playful turn of mind to which I refer later, and which has had some strange results, by wishing that the wreath he is sending may " adorn the neck " of the Egyptian king for " 100,000 years."

That Dusratta, King of Mitanni or Mesopotamia, Armenia and Syria, the ruler of parts, if not of all of Asia Minor, the King of the Minnyans, the wonderful people who had once conquered and reigned in Egypt, the King of the " Land of the great prince," who was also the relation and ally of the Egyptian kings could have been overcome by the Hittites, one of the seven Canaanitish tribes, who had for generations been tributary to the Egyptians, is impossible.

Yet the translators believe that Hittites conquered Dusratta ! They ignore his claims to victory, which claims we shall presently examine, and accepting other evidence which contradicts his, they say that he was overcome by a Hittite king who they take for granted belonged to the same race as the Hittites of the Bible and who they believe at the same time was the ruler of a " Great Hittite Empire."

Their reasons for believing this as well as my reasons for believing the opposite must now be given.

CHAPTER X

DUSRATTA'S LETTERS

OF all the translations of Dusratta's letters Major Conder's are the most convincing, chiefly because they are more colloquial than others. This is explained by the fact that the language of the Amarna Tablets is much like that of the modern peasantry of Palestine, which language Major Conder had spoken daily for seven years (Conder, "Preface"), his translations, which I mostly quote, may therefore be more accurate than others; they can hardly be less so.

Professor Petrie, who publishes Professor Winckler's translations of the Amarna Tablets, refers to the accession of Dusratta and his troubles from the Khatti (Hittites). He remarks that, as the Khatti land was close to Dusratta's country of Mitanni, Dusratta would naturally be in the way of their attacks (*Syria and Egypt*, p. 28). The "Land of Khatithan" shown by inscriptions to have been conquered by Amenhotep the second, who after its conquest crossed the Euphrates to invade Dusratta's land of Mitanni (Hall, p. 253), is evidently meant by Professor Petrie. The Khatti therefore who were troubling Dusratta lived in the Biblical "Land of the Hittites" and were tributary, as we have seen, to the Egyptians, for according to the Bible the Hittites land was bounded by the Euphrates as was the "Land of Khatithan" of Egyptian inscriptions.

Why those tributary Hittites dared to attack Dusratta we see by the following letter which also shows that the "Khatti's" attacks did not trouble Dusratta so much as the professor seems to think they did.

Dusratta writes to Amenhotep the third; he says that someone, who Major Conder thinks was a rebellious brother

of Dusratta's, brought "all who were in the land of the Hittites" into his land, that he was not afraid and had slain all the chiefs who had supported his brother and him as well, and that not one of the Hittites had returned to his own land. (Conder, p. 165.)

Major Conder's opinion that it was Dusratta's brother who brought the Hittites against him in battle is probably the right one, for, unless led by someone of that kind, the Hittites who were tributary to the Egyptian king could hardly have dared to attack Dusratta, the relation and friend of their lord and master.

That the Hittites were tributary to Amenhotep the third, as the other Canaanites of Palestine were is proved by Dusratta's letters as well as by the Egyptian inscriptions before referred to.

In what Major Conder says is a much broken letter, Dusratta writes to Amenhotep about the marriage of his daughter, Tadukhipa to Amenhotep's son, afterwards Amenhotep the fourth (C., p. 173).

Dusratta says: "My court having decided to accept and being satisfied as well as my wife . . . and the girl being heartily pleased . . . how happy she is words cannot tell . . . for me the decision is from the gods, my brother, surely you know that I shall be glad. . . ." Here Dusratta comes to business, "Proclaim thou for me that whatever people west of the Minnyan country (according to Major Conder, the Hittites' land was west of that country) I being the great chief of the Hittites, taking unto me, my brother, all the people that are conquered . . . let it extend to the city of Harran."

Dusratta evidently asks Amenhotep the third to proclaim him the chief of the Hittites.

The next sentences from another broken letter prove that that was Dusratta's meaning. He writes to his son-in-law, Amenhotep the fourth, after Amenhotep the third's death, telling him how his father had complied with that request and in return for his daughter had established him in Hittite cities (C., p. 179).

Dusratta writes: "And Amenhotep the third, established us . . . for the future, and so receiving I was made

great . . . in the cities which for Tadukhipa . . . in all of them he made us to dwell as conquerors." These two letters corroborate one another, the accuracy of their translations can hardly be doubted. They show plainly that the Hittites had been tributary to Amenhotep the third, before their conquest by Dusratta, who naturally had to ask Amenhotep's consent before taking final possession of them.

Knudtson's translation of the same letter (K., p. 1054) agrees in important points with that of Major Conder. It shows that Dusratta asked to be made protector over Hittite cities and volunteered to guard the Egyptian boundaries with his own Mitannian soldiers. In another letter (K., p. 1052) Dusratta offers Amenhotep soldiers trained by himself. Those soldiers were probably the "men from Kassi" whom the Canaanite ruler Ribaddi begs the Egyptian king to send him to help him against the Israelites. Those soldiers according to Professor Petrie were Egyptian "auxiliary troops" (p. 29).

That Dusratta only ruled over part of the Hittites in Palestine is proved by the fact that according to the Bible a Hittite army fought against Joshua before Sidon while, as the Tablets show, Dusratta was fighting upon Joshua's side.

Dusratta's letter announcing his victory over the Hittites is also published by Professor Petrie. Although somewhat different from Major Conder's translation it shows that Dusratta conquered the Hittites. (Petrie, p. 29.)

Dusratta says: "The Khatti (Hittites) came into Dusratta's land but Dusratta's god, Tishub, gave them into his hand. Dusratta sends a chariot, two horses, a lad and a girl of the booty of the Khatti, also five chariots and pairs of horses, etc."

Although he publishes this triumphant letter Professor Petrie remarks (p. 27) that at that time the Hittites had begun to occupy Syria (Dusratta's land). It could only have been as prisoners of war.

Professor Hogarth, like Professor Petrie, ignores Dusratta's claims to victory, he announces definitely that "the Hittite king conquered Dusratta, king of Mitanni and by doing so obtained lasting dominion in Syria."

Major Conder gives Dusratta the benefit of the doubt. He writes : "Thus Dusratta who says that he has conquered the Hittites would seem to have swallowed up the Hittite king, and the Mongol populations were to be ruled from Armenia." (His expression "Mongol populations" means the Hittites.) He also writes : "From Dusratta's great Hittite letter it appears that the king of the Minnyans, whose country was called Mitanni, west of Lake Van, in Armenia, claimed to be king of all the Hittites (p. 47).

Professor Weber who also seems to doubt Dusratta's victory over the Hittites writes : "Dusratta says he destroyed the Hittite army," he quotes Dusratta's words, "not one returned to his own country." (Knudtzon, p. 1035.)

The translators' reasons for doubting Dusratta's claim to victory deserve of course careful examination.

Professor Weber gives his reason. He writes : "The Hatti king is said to be an enemy of Tuseratta* of Mitanni who relates that he has had a decisive victory over the Hittites. On the other hand Ribaddi tells the king of Egypt that the Hatti king has conquered the Mitanni land."

The Professor seems to accept Ribaddi's word against that of Dusratta which is strange, for upon cross examination Ribaddi's evidence proves most unreliable.

* In some letters Dusratta calls himself Tuseratta.

CHAPTER XI

RIBADDI'S EVIDENCE

RIBADDI was, as we have seen, the Canaanitish ruler of Phœnician cities which were being besieged by the Israelites, whom he sometimes calls the Haberi or Sagas, and at other times calls the sons of Abdasherah.

He was evidently bewildered by what Professor Petrie describes as "the complex politics" of his time; and a more puzzling position than his, could hardly be imagined.

He was placed much as a loyal Indian prince of to-day, would be if suddenly attacked by strange armies which he could not identify and which were conquering the British possessions in India while the British troops instead of opposing the invaders, were leaving the country, and his appeals to the British government for help received no answer.

That Ribaddi could not make out who his enemies were, any more than why they were attacking him, is shown by his letters to Amenhotep the fourth, which also show that he could not understand Amenhotep's policy. In some letters he begs for Amenhotep's help, in others he accuses that king of allowing the Israelites to take the cities of Palestine. He writes: "And you relinquish the wealth of all the lands. Why is then this overthrow of thy land?" (C., p. 62). And "Why are you favourable to the Hebrew chiefs and unfavourable to the native subject princes?" (Winckler). He writes again: "Who is Abdasherah? a slave, a dog, O king it is thy land, and they have joined the king of the Land of Mitanni. But come to us" (C., p. 68) and "Also since the time of your father the city of Sidon has submitted to the occupation by his allies (Abdasherah's). Let the king regard the message of his servant. Let him give men to guard his city. Is not she

insulted by all the men of blood (Ameluti Saga) and "since the king's heart altogether has forgotten my Egyptian soldiers (bitati) I send to Yankhamu and to Biri" (Egyptian officials in Palestine), (p. 74). In another letter Ribaddi writes: "And my sons are servants of the king, and our expectation is from the king . . . the city is perishing, my lord has pronounced our death . . ." and "behold the king lets slip from his hand the chief city which is faithful to him but you care not for us" (C., p. 85).

That Amenhotep the fourth should willingly relinquish his possessions in Palestine to the Israelites must have seemed inexplicable to Ribaddi. He probably knew little or nothing about the Egyptian king's change of religion, or the miraculous events in Egypt (recorded in the Book of Exodus) which had led up to it. That he could not clearly identify his adversaries is evident.

He writes to Amenhotep: "Who are the sons of Abdasherah? The King of the Kassi and the King of Mitanni are they, and they take the king's lands for themselves." (K., p. 463.)

As Dusratta was both King of Kassi and of Mitanni this shows that Ribaddi was under some misconception about him, we see too, that he confuses him with the "sons of Abdasherah" (the Israelites).

In another letter Ribaddi confuses Dusratta with the king of the Hittites. He writes: "Who are the sons of Abdasherah that they take the land of the king for themselves? The King of Mitanni are they and the King of Kassi and the King of Hatti (the Hittite land)." (K., p. 507.)

I hope to show that although Ribaddi seems to mention three different kings, they were really one and the same person under different titles, and that that person was Dusratta of Mitanni.

Convinced as I am of this, the following letter quoted by Professor Weber as proof that Dusratta was conquered by Hittites, seems to me only more evidence that Ribaddi could not understand what was going on in Palestine outside his own cities. Ribaddi writes: "The King of Hatti has conquered

the lands of the King of Mitanni or the King of Narima" (Mesopotamia, Dusratta's land) (K., p. 379). After which statement Ribaddi says "the lands of the king has Abdasherah the dog taken."

That Ribaddi should refer to Abdasherah here, that he should call him a dog, apparently because of the King of Hatti's misdoings, suggests that he thought they were the same person; yet in other letters Abdasherah was, according to Ribaddi the King of Mitanni. He writes: "Who is Abdasherah, the dog, who takes the king's lands for himself? The king of Mitanni and the king of Kassi is he." These contradictory remarks disqualify Ribaddi's evidence; that it has been preferred to that of Dusratta is incomprehensible. Ribaddi's evidence puzzles the German professors as their comments upon one of his letters show. Ribaddi writes to Amenhotep the fourth: "I have heard that the Hatti people burn the land with fire. . . . All the lands of the king my lord are taken. . . . And now see, the soldiers of the Hatti land come to take Gubla. . . . I fear for the town . . . and now hear about the . . . people . . . they have given all the silver and gold to the sons of Abdasherah, and the sons of Abdasherah have given it to the mighty king." (K., p. 543.)

This letter is commented upon in Professor Knudtzon's book (p. 1089). "The Hatti king is naturally called the Mighty King, through whom the sons of Abdasherah became strong after they had given him gold and silver." Upon another page of the same book however (p. 1205) the commentator writes of the same letter: "The . . . people had given all the gold and silver to the sons of Abdasherah and they had given them to the Mighty King who," he adds, "is in every case the King of Mitanni."

Considering that the Professors believe that the King of Hatti and the king of Mitanni were different people and hostile to each other, this seems a serious difference of opinion for which no explanation is given.

Incidentally and from another point of view this letter invites further speculation. Ribaddi had heard vague rumours

of a "Mighty King" to whom the sons of Abdasherah (the Israelites) had given gold and silver, and who, in return, had made them strong. Like the professors, Ribaddi was undecided as to whether the "Mighty King" was the Hittite King or the Mitannian King. But surely the greatest probability is that he was neither! Remembering the strict command given to the Israelites, that the silver and gold taken from the Canaanites was to be sacred to their God, it seems obvious that only to Him would they, with Joshua's consent, have offered their spoils of silver and gold. (Joshua vi. 19.)

The one thing clearly proved by Ribaddi's evidence is that he was being attacked at the same time by the King of Mitanni, people called Hittites and the Israelites (sons of Abdasherah). That the Israelites and the King of Mitanni should have been allies is natural for they were all Hebrews but if the King of the Hittites had been a Canaanite as he is thought to have been, his alliance with the Israelites would have been most unnatural!

The only solution of the problem presented by Ribaddi's evidence seems to me to be that Dusratta was both the King of Mitanni and the King of the Hittites mentioned in that evidence.

In other letters Ribaddi says: "Behold the soldiers of the Land of the Hittites have trampled down our papyrus" (C., p. 90).

As we have seen Dusratta's soldiers were to guard the Egyptian king's boundaries in the land of the Hittites and he had been given Hittite towns (K., p. 1054); it is not strange therefore that Ribaddi describes them as the soldiers of that land.

He writes again: "From the Hittite chief men have fled; all the chiefs are afraid thereof" (C., p. 55). At the same time he shows that the Israelites were also attacking his cities, he writes: "The sons of the dog, Abdasherah, destroy the cities and the corn and attack the governors, they demand fifty talents and have . . . (Major Conder says the verb is lost) to the temples of the gods of Gebal" (C., p. 55). Probably the Israelites had destroyed those temples.

The following sentence makes it certain that the Israelites were allied with Dusratta of Mitanni and Kassi and with the so-called King of the Hittites. Ribaddi writes: "The sons of Abdasherah have joined the King of the Land of Mitanni and the King of Kassi and the King of the Land of the Hittites" (C., p. 53). The Israelites could not have allied themselves with a Hittite king therefore this King of the Hittites can only have been Dusratta.

Major Conder remarks upon what he thought was an alliance between Dusratta and the Hittites, he says: "The King of Mitanni . . . leagued with the Hittites against Egypt" (p. 5). Professor Weber also mentions this alliance (K., p. 1083) but it seems to have escaped Professor Sayce's notice.

He writes: "The Hittites were already pressing southward and were causing serious alarm to the governors and allies of the Egyptian king." Amenhotep's great ally Dusratta however, instead of being alarmed by the Hittites' advance southwards, was advancing with them and with them was attacking the Phœnician cities which were tributary to the Egyptian king. If Professor Sayce noticed this how did he account for it?

Major Conder's statement that the King of Mitanni leagued with the Hittites against Egypt although satisfactory in showing that Dusratta and the supposed Hittites were fighting on the same side is otherwise misleading. It was not against Egypt, but against the Egyptian king's tributary subjects, the Canaanites, that Dusratta was fighting in accordance (as already seen) with the Egyptian king's wishes. How could Dusratta have fought against the Egyptians themselves? His sister and daughter were successively the Queens of Egypt and his letters show the affection he felt for their husbands, the Egyptian kings. Letters from Dusratta which we shall examine later show how impossible it is that Dusratta "leagued against Egypt." Nor, I maintain, did he "league" against the Hittites as Major Conder thought he did; on the contrary he, as the Tablets prove, had conquered Hittites, taken possession of Hittite cities, and in a letter to the Egyptian king, calls himself "the chief of

the Hittites." That the " King of the Land of the Hittites " and the " soldiers of the Land of the Hittites " mentioned by Ribaddi, must have been Dusratta and his men seems obvious but the translators have not come to that conclusion !

They believe that the " King of the Hittites " mentioned by Ribaddi was called Subbiluliuma and that he conquered Dusratta, although be it remembered, it is admitted that Dusratta was " leagued " with the Hittites.

Professor Hogarth writes : " Subbiluliuma (Saplel or Sapašura), the Hittite king, a contemporary of Amenhotep the fourth of Egypt . . . seems to have obtained lasting dominion over Syria by subduing Dusratta of Mitanni."

CHAPTER XII

FALSE WITNESSES

THIS information clashes with Dusratta's letters, with the most convincing part of Ribaddi's evidence which proves that Dusratta was allied with people called Hittites and also, as we have seen, with the Bible Records. It is found upon the cuneiform tablets which have been excavated at Boghaz Keue in Cappadocia. It is largely upon the evidence of those tablets that the theory of the Hittite Empire has been built up. Their evidence seems to be preferred by Dr. Hall and other authorities to that of the Amarna Tablets.

Ignoring Dusratta's claim to have conquered the Hittites Dr. Hall tells us that the Hittites "destroyed" Dusratta's country during that king's lifetime. (about the time of the Conquest of Palestine by the Israelites) (p. 400) and that after Dusratta's death Subbiluliuma king of the Hittites took possession of the whole of Mitanni which is said to have been in a state of anarchy at that time (p. 351).

This information is given by the Boghaz Keue Documents ; I hope to prove it false !

Dr. Hall quotes the following passage from the Boghaz Keue Tablets, in which passage Subbiluliuma claims to have taken possession of Mitanni after Dusratta's death. The passage runs : " Till now had the Sun, Subbiluliuma, the Great King, the noble King of Khatti, beloved of Teshub, refrained from crossing the Euphrates and had taken neither taxes nor tribute from the Land of Mitanni, but when the Great King saw the desolation of the Land of Mitanni he sent men of the palace, oxen, sheep and horses for the men of Khani (Mitannians) were in misery ; Shutatara and his nobles endeavoured to slay Mattiuaza the son of the king, but he fled

and came to the Sun Subbiluliuma, the Great King. The Great King spake, Teshub had decided his right for him, since I now take Mattiuaza, the son of the King Dusratta by the hand and set him upon his throne. In order that the Land of Mitanni, the Great Land, may not disappear, hath the Great King Subbiluliuma summoned it to life for the sake of his daughter. For Mattiuaza, the son of Dusratta, have I taken by the hand and have given him my daughter to wife" (Hall, p. 351). Dr. Hall conjectures about Subbiluliuma. "With a fine touch of contempt, not for the sake of the rightful king Dusratta's son, but for that of his daughter to whom he now married him, the Hittite Bismarck entered Mitanni . . . and placed Mattiuaza on the throne of Dusratta as his son-in-law and vassal" (p. 352).

My inference from the Amarna letters is, that Dr. Hall's "Hittite Bismarck" Subbiluliuma was nothing more than a name invented by Dusratta and made use of after his death by the priests who concocted the story of Subbiluliuma's acquisition of Mitanni.

As before remarked, a striking difference exists between the Boghaz Keuie Documents and the Amarna Tablets. Instead of being diplomatic correspondence like the Amarna letters they are the work of priests and share many peculiarities with the Egyptian priestly inscriptions. The Hittite States, as they are called, of which the Boghaz Keuie Documents are supposed to be the archives, are said to have had their capital at Boghaz Keuie, "a great city of the Khatti" in Northern Cappadocia (*Enc. Britt.*, Vol. 13, p. 538).

If, as Professor Sayce seems to think*, Kassi, over which Dusratta ruled, was Cappadocia in Asia Minor and as there is evidence to show that he ruled over Cilicia as well, it seems probable that Boghaz Keuie was one of Dusratta's cities.

According to Professor Sayce (*Soc. of Bibl. Arch.*, 1905) those "Hittite states" were a colony of priests, he writes: "The Hittite States were theocratic, the king being also high priest and both he and his people took names from the supreme deity, the Sandian; Sandes is symbolised by the serpent."

* Hittite inscriptions.

He describes the revolting nature of their so-called religion in which children were sacrificed to their gods (Sayce, Kadesh and Napthali) and writes: "Their progress through Asia Minor was characterised by the rise of priestly cities and the growth of a class of armed priestesses . . . the entire population ministered to the deity to whom the city was dedicated, the sanctuary of the deity stood in the centre and the chief authority was wielded by a high priest; if a king existed at all he came in course of time to fill a merely subordinate position . . . the Hittite priests on the days of festival cut their arms and scourged themselves in honour of their deities . . . such actions remind us of those priests of Baal who 'cut themselves after their manner with knives and lancets till the blood gushed out of them.'"

Those priests of Baal, worshippers of the serpent and of another deity represented by an Ass's head, left behind them the inscriptions and pictures from which has been evolved the theory of a "Great Hittite Empire!" That their testimony is as unreliable as that of the Egyptian priests I hope to prove by showing that no Hittite king named Subbiluliuma existed at the end of the Eighteenth Dynasty, and that the information given about him upon the Boghaz Keui Tablets must therefore have been entirely invented by them.

In that priest-ridden country, once the kingdom of Dusratta and his ancestors before him, almost all trace of the splendid age which had preceded them was, I firmly believe, wiped out by the priests. Professor Sayce shows that the priests of Syria and Egypt were in communication with one another by saying: "The Hittites (who he tells us were 'all priests') carried the time-worn civilisations of Babylonia and Egypt to the furthest boundary of Asia." Unless the priests of Syria (the so-called Hittites) had been in communication with the priests of those other countries, they could not have done this, nor could the Hittite hieroglyphics have been inspired by the Egyptian hieroglyphics as Professor Sayce says they were. (*The Hittites*, p. 124.)

That priestcraft existed in Dusratta's country in his time is shown by the fact that he invokes the gods Teshub and

Amen; probably like King Solomon, who in his old age followed Ashtoreth and Milcom, "the abomination of the Amorites." Dusratta had partly forgotten the religion of his fathers, although he may still have been enough influenced by it to sympathise with Amenhotep's plans, and to help the Israelites to conquer Palestine, as the Tablets prove he did.

It can easily be imagined how unpopular Amenhotep's and Dusratta's policy in helping on Joshua's conquest of Palestine must have been with the priests of both countries. That a conspiracy existed between the Aramæan and Egyptian priests against the kings who helped the Israelites to conquer Palestine, that those kings were assassinated and false reports about them circulated by the priests who from that time manufactured Egyptian and Syrian history, is my firm conviction! The Amarna Tablets show that Abdasherah was murdered (K., p. 1197). As it is Ribaddi who tells Amenhotep this, and who, as we have seen, mixes up Abdasherah with Dusratta, it may well have been Dusratta's murder which he refers to. In one letter Ribaddi says that Abdasherah is "sick unto death" and in another letter he says that Abdasherah has been killed! (K., p. 1197). Probably this means that Dusratta had been poisoned. A supposition which is supported by the fact that upon the Boghaz Keui Tablets Dusratta is said to have been murdered. (Hall, p. 351.)

That Amenhotep the fourth was also murdered and his city destroyed by the priests is strongly suggested by the following statements. Sir Ernest Budge writes: "Twenty-five years after the death of Amenhotep the fourth, Tel-el-Amarna was deserted . . . the buildings fell into decay . . . the god Amen and his priests had conquered Aten [Amenhotep's supposed object of worship] and Egyptian art once again put on its shackles of conventionality in obedience to their behests."

Another Egyptologist (Weigall, *Akhnaton*, p. 224) writes: "Akhnaton [Amenhotep the fourth] could not longer stave off the impending crash, and from all sides there gathered the forces which were to overwhelm him. . . . The plotting and scheming of the priests of Amon showed signs of coming to a successful issue. The anger of the priesthoods of the other

gods of Egypt hung over the palace like some menacing stormcloud. . . . " And on page 226 he writes : " History tells us only that, simultaneously with the fall of his empire Amenhotep died ! " On another page he writes (p. 235) : " The abandonment of the City of the Horizon (Tel-el-Amarnâ) appears to have been carried out in haste, and one may suppose that events shaped themselves so as to place in the hands of the reactionary party the power to demand a sudden and instant evacuation of Akhnaton's city. The excavations of the Egypt Exploration Society have revealed the bones of Akhnaton's dogs in the royal kennels, as though these unfortunate animals had been left to starve when the court marched away ; and dead oxen have also been found in the sheds of the King's farm, lying where they were abandoned. The city itself shows other signs of having been suddenly left to its fate, and it was not long before the palaces and the villas became the home of the jackals and the owls, while the temples were partly pulled down to provide stone for other works."

The malicious priests who handed down Amenhotep upon the monuments as a deformed imbecile, who described him, although his ideals resembled those of Christianity, as " that Criminal of Akhnaton," and who desecrated his tomb, may well be suspected of having murdered him and his family and wrecked his city.

The way in which the Egyptian priests of former days treated the memory of the Hebrew or Aramaean princes, (the Hyksos kings), who had conquered Egypt about seven hundred years before Dusratta's time, proves how they invented history. Absurd names that no living man would have owned, such as Salatis, meaning many lies, Beon, meaning filthy fellow, and Apachnas, meaning bondslave, were applied to the greatest Hyksos rulers by the priests (*Osburn Mon. Hist.*), although it was, as is now known, those Hyksos rulers who brought civilisation and also the art of war into Egypt from Syria.

Dr. Hall remarks : " The Egyptians spoke slightly of their Hyksos conquerors as mere shepherds, Bedouins of the desert, but there is little doubt that they were mainly civilised Syrians." (p. 212). Until now writers have unanimously described the Hyksos as barbarians, " the Barbaric invaders of

Egypt" (*Times History*, Vol. 1, p. 126) evidently following the Egyptian priestly historian of about 150 B.C. who calls the Hyksos an "ignoble race."

That an "ignoble race" or even "mere shepherds" should have practised arithmetic, applied mathematics, astronomy and naturalism in art as the Hyksos are known to have done; that they should have also introduced the chariot into Egypt (Hall, p. 213) and that they should have conquered Egypt without a battle as Manetho naïvely remarks that they did, is incredible! The Hyksos monuments, the finest Egyptian works of art, were wilfully broken up, as Professor Petrie tells us (Tanis), thrown down wells, the features altered, and the names erased, evidently in the hope of hiding from future generations the fact that under the Hebrew princes from Syria Egypt had enjoyed its Golden Age. Considering that the Hyksos are said by Manetho to have closed the temples of the Egyptian gods and to have forbidden their worship (their religion was evidently that of the Hebrews), the reason why the priests hated them, and tried to obliterate all traces of their rule in Egypt, is obvious.

In the same way traces of the reigns of the three so-called "Heretic kings" (*Times History*, Vol. 1, p. 139) Thothmes the fourth, Amenhotep the third, and his son were wiped out as far as possible by the priests. Their names were omitted from several priestly lists of the kings of Egypt. That the priests had invented those names as well as those of the Hyksos kings and in the same malicious and lying spirit, is certain.

That Amenhotep the third is called Nimmuria, and his son, Amenhotep the fourth, is called Naphuria by Dusratta, while Amenhotep the third calls himself Nimmuria in writing to Dusratta, proves that those were their real names. The name Amenhotep was probably unknown to the three "heretic kings."

It would have been the last name they would have chosen; according to Egyptologists, Amenhotep the third and his Mitannian wife turned against the worship and the priests of Amen. They would not have called their son, Amenhotep; nor is the so-called Thothmes the fourth likely to have called his son, "Amenhotep" by that name for it is now admitted

that he too had turned against Amen and the priests of Amen (Weigall, *Akhnaton*, p. 18) and had also married a Hebrew princess from Mitanni!

According to the *Times History* (Vol. 1., p. 162) Egypt passed into the power of the priests after the time of the Ramesside kings. I contend that it did so at the end of Amenhotep the fourth's reign, when the priests evidently began their work of destruction! A remark of Dr. Hall's supports this contention, he says that the tomb of Thothmes the fourth was violated as early as "the confusion of Akhenaten's reign" (Hall, p. 294). At that time therefore the priests were already in power. Dr. Hall writes (p. 294): "The royal mummies had all been removed in the time of the priest kings, either to the pit near Der el Bahri, or to the tomb of Amenhotep the second"; he also says that the body found in Queen Tii's tomb was not her's, he writes: "The operation of removal was however effected in such haste and confusion that although Tii's catafalque, dedicated to her by Akhenaten (Amenhotep the fourth) and her golden diadem were placed in the tomb, her body was either left behind at Tel-el-Amarna or buried elsewhere!"

Dr. Hall seems to think that all this was done by someone named Tut-ank-hamen, the supposed second successor and son-in-law of Amenhotep the fourth, in good faith and reverence. It is surely easier to see in this summary treatment of the great Queen Tii's remains the "fury of the priests of Amen" remarked upon elsewhere by Dr. Hall (p. 301) with everything and everyone connected with the "heretic kings." The "soldiers and statesmen" who as Dr. Hall says, "saw with bitterness the work of a dynasty abandoned and thrown away at the caprice of a boy," were probably all priests; in the Egyptian inscriptions we find high priests calling themselves the "Commander in Chief of the Army" (Breasted, Vol. 4, p. 318).

• It was undoubtedly into the hands of the priests that the government of Egypt had passed at the time of Amenhotep the fourth's death.

CHAPTER XIII

COPIES—COUNTERPARTS AND FORGERIES

THE likeness between the Egyptian priestly records and those of Boghaz Keuie is unquestionable. Describing art and literature in the period succeeding the Eighteenth Dynasty, when as we have seen all power had passed into the hands of the Egyptian priests, the *Times History* says (Vol. I, p. 152): "Everything is a copy and is carefully worked out from a fixed model; it has often been remarked how greatly the historical value of the reports has suffered through this." Undoubted copies also appear in the Boghaz Keuie Documents. Those "remarkable counterparts," as Professor Weber calls them (K., p. 1060), found in them of historical information given by the Amarna Tablets probably many years before, are enough to discredit anything recorded in those documents.

The unique position of Queen Thi, for instance, travestied as it probably was by the Egyptian priests in the fabulous story of Queen Hatsheput, for which there is only priestly authority, is attributed in the Boghaz Keuie Documents to a Hittite Queen Puduhepa, whose name seems like a caricature of that of Dusratta's daughter, Tadukhipa. Puduhepa is said to have been Queen Regent in Mitanni as Queen Teie had been in Egypt and just as Queen Teie had received, as we know, from the Amarna Tablets, a letter from Dusratta soon after her husband's death, Puduhepa is said to have received a letter from Rameses the second, after her husband's death.

Just as Queen Teie is shown in the Amarna letters to have corresponded with Dusratta's wife, so, in the Boghaz Keuie Documents, Queen Puduhepa is said to have written to the wife of Rameses.

These palpable imitations (commented upon by the German writers) help to disqualify the evidence of the Boghaz Keuié Documents, while the capacity of the Egyptian priests for invention may be gauged in many ways, for instance in the story of Rameses the Great as recounted upon the wall of the Ramesseum, his so-called funerary temple, described by Dr. Hall as "a gigantic usurpation, erected apparently with the stones of the splendid funerary temple of Amenhotep the third" (p. 317). Amenhotep's "funerary temple" had then been wantonly demolished, and obviously by the priests.

Dr. Hall writes: "The name of Rameses the second bulks largely in Egypt. It is impossible to get away from it for long. Hardly a temple but has been restored or otherwise spoilt by him, hardly a statue of a preceding king that has not been partially or wholly usurped by him" (p. 317) and "he has until lately been commonly given an honorific title which may fitly be conceded to Thothmes III, but is in no way deserved by Rameses II."

Sir Ernest Budge writes in the *British Museum Catalogue* that "Rameses frequently usurped the works of his predecessors and inscribed his own name on statues which he did not make." As the priests of that time were, as it is expressed "the sacred sculptors, draughtsmen and masons" all those destructions and usurpations must have been their handiwork. They could therefore put any inscriptions they chose upon the monuments of the preceding kings.

My perhaps startling theory that the Ramesside kings were only priestly inventions, as were also the three intervening kings between Amenhotep the fourth, and the first Rameses, whose reigns are crammed into eight years by Professor Breasted (*Anc. Egypt.*, Vol. I., p. 43), and that the name Rameses was only a "copy" of that of the city Rameses which had, according to the Bible, existed at least five hundred years before Rameses is said to have lived, cannot be discussed here.

A king who, as the inscriptions say, overcame, single-handed an enemy described as "multitudinous as the sand"—"covering mountains and valleys like grasshoppers

for their number"—the serpent in whose diadem spat fire in the face of his enemies, who are said to have thrown themselves down on the ground from fear of Rameses who picked them up one by one only to throw them into the river Orontes "like crocodiles," is surely too wonderful to be believed in as implicitly as Rameses the Great has been.

Rameses has been called "The Great Forger." Is it not possible that he was himself one of the priests' forgeries?

Dr. Wright says: "The Reverend T. K. Cheyne, who places the inscriptions of Egypt before the Bible Records in veracity, receives as authentic this representation of the battle. 'Rameses' he says 'was indeed victorious but he owed his life and consequently his victory to his personal bravery and . . . his childlike faith in his god.'"

Dr. Wright remarks: "I am inclined to agree with Brugsch Bey, that Rameses came out of the battle a doubtful conqueror. I am the more inclined to think so because an immediate peace followed the battle." (*Empire of the Hittites*, p. 109.)

The German Professor Meyer doubts Rameses' veracity. He says (*Times History*, Vol. 1, p. 153): "It was only boasting when Rameses gave long lists of conquered people and towns in his temple inscriptions . . . it can at once be seen that it is no historical document."

Professor Breasted also suspects the reliability of some of the priestly inscriptions, he says that the account of Queen Hatsheput's coronation is taken verbatim from the account of Amenhotep the third's coronation and "deserves no more credence than the geographical lists of Rameses the third at Medinet Habu, which have been copied from the lists of the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Dynasties, he writes: "It is clear that this entire coronation of Hatsheput, like the supernatural birth, is an artificial creation, a fiction of later origin. . . . As such it is closely paralleled by the similar representations of Rameses II in his great Abydos inscription with the sole difference that his father is stated to have remained as co-regent on the throne." (*Anc. Egypt*, Vol. 2, p. 95.)

Here then, as in the Boghaz Keuie Documents we find suspicious "counterparts" in the priestly writings. In spite

of these and other even stronger indications (to be noticed later) that the priestly inscriptions of Egypt, Babylonia and Syria are "no historical documents" and cannot be relied upon, it is concluded from their evidence that Dusratta of Mitanni was, as Professor Hogarth says, "overcome by the Hittite king Subbiluliuma," who according to the Amarna Tablets can have been nothing more than a name invented by Dusratta.

The story told by the priests upon the Boghaz Keuie Tablets is that Dusratta was murdered by his own son, who then fled to the Hittite king for protection. Subbiluliuma is said to have married his daughter to the Mitannian prince and to have placed them both upon the Mitannian throne under his own protection.

Since the Amarna Tablets give reason to believe (as I shall now explain) that Subbiluliuma was only a name assumed by Dusratta and afterwards copied by the priests when they concocted the story of a Hittite King of that name, all that the Boghaz Keuie Documents tell of the murder of Dusratta and the Hittite rule in Mitanni must have been invented by the priests, who, in all probability were themselves the murderers of Dusratta.

CHAPTER XIV

DUSRATTA'S ASSUMED NAMES

ACCORDING to Dr. Hall (p. 344) Subbiluliuma, king of the Hittites, had taken certain lands from Dusratta shortly before the death of Amenhotep the third.

Upon the Boghaz Keuie Tablets Subbiluliuma is made to say "On account of the King Dusratta's disobedience I have plundered all these lands in one year, and brought them to Khatta, from the mountain Niblani from the Euphrates have I made them my territory."

Dr. Hall, commenting upon that letter says: "The death of Amenhotep the third now probably occurred. When messengers from Egypt came to him with the news of the accession of Amenhotep the fourth, Subbiluliuma sent with an ill grace a somewhat surly letter of congratulations to the new king of Egypt" (p. 345).

Although Dr. Hall concludes that Dusratta had suffered heavy losses at Subbiluliuma's hands shortly before the accession of Amenhotep the fourth, Dusratta writes to that king and to his mother about that time as if nothing had happened.

To Amenhotep he writes saying how he had loved his father and how he had fasted and mourned when he received the news of his death. He begins this letter with the words: "I am at peace" (C., p. 176). To Queen Teie he writes: "To the Princess of the Land of Egypt, thus Dusratta, King of Mitanni, I am at peace" (C., p. 190).

Would he have done so if a large part of his empire had just been conquered and occupied by the enemy?

Before explaining my reasons for believing that the name Subbiluliuma was invented by Dusratta and that no Hittite king of that name ever existed and, also, to support

them, I hope to prove that Dusratta invented other names as well, either playfully or to disguise the fact that he had written certain letters.

Dusratta's assumed names have, I firmly believe, grievously mislead the translators.

Some of his letters to the Egyptian kings, perhaps all of them, passed through Palestine, where they might have been waylaid by the Canaanites against whom Dusratta was evidently plotting with the Egyptian king.

To write under different names, and in some kind of artificial dialect as Dusratta did and Amenhotep, as we shall see, also did in writing to Dusratta, may well have been from motives of secrecy. Several letters found at Tel-el-Amarna, ostensibly from someone calling himself Dasru, are almost certainly from Dusratta.

Professor Weber says of Dasru (K., p. 1321): "About the writer who is only mentioned in his own letters nothing is known."

Although he uses the same servile expressions of devotion to Amenhotep as do the Canaanitish rulers Dasru cannot have been one of those rulers, for instead of the lamentations and prayers for help with which their letters are filled, his letters express perfect satisfaction with the affairs in Palestine, where, as we know, the Israelites were conquering the Canaanitish cities.

Dasru writes: "At the feet of my lord the King seven times and seven times I fall. All the King my lord does to his land is good in the highest, highest degree" (K., p. 823).

Dasru writes again: "to the king, my lord, my sun, has spoken Dasru the king's true servant. At the feet of the king my lord, seven times and seven times I fall down. Everything possible! What has said the king my lord, I have heard" (K., p. 12).

In another letter Dasru says: "All that the King has said have I understood" (K., p. 823).

Of all Amenhotep's correspondents the only one who could have understood what the Egyptian king was doing was obviously his relation and friend Dusratta, who as the Tablets

prove, helped the Israelites to conquer Phoenicia. Surely Dasru was Dusratta!

Another mysterious correspondent of the Egyptian kings, who I suspect of being Dusratta writes from the city of Kadesh, which Major Conder calls the "Capital of the Southern Hittites" (p. 40). The writer calls himself Edagama (Itakama) which name is said to mean, "Victorious Lord" (C., p. 15). He tells the Egyptian king that the Haberi (the Israelites) have taken some of the Egyptian cities in Palestine and offers to go and drive them out.

Now who but Dusratta was strong enough to think of driving out the Israelites? Certainly none of the Canaanitish rulers, at any rate unsupported; Ribaddi, seemingly the most powerful of those rulers, dared not attempt it alone; he tells the Egyptian king that if one other ruler would join him he would go and drive out the Israelites (Conder, and Petrie, p. 63).

My belief is that Dusratta, having heard that the Israelites were taking the cities of Northern Palestine wrote to Amenhotep calling himself Edagama and offering to turn the invaders out, not understanding at that time as he did later that the Egyptian king wished the Israelites to take possession of their Promised Land.

Edagama was, according to Major Conder (p. 15) a Hittite king while Dr. Hall (p. 342) conjectures that he was the son of Dusratta's brother and was intriguing with Dusratta's brother against Dusratta with the Hittite king. The fact that Edagama writes as if on friendly terms with the Egyptian king who was Dusratta's ally, makes this conjecture improbable.

Much more important however is the letter from Tarkhundarush, who I claim was also Dusratta under an assumed name. If the word Tarkhun meant chief as Major Conder (p. 219), and other authorities think it does, Tarkhundarush probably meant Chief Dusratta.

If as Professor Sayce thinks, there was some connection between the words Tarkhun and Subbi the same reason, whatever it was which prompted Dusratta to give himself the name Tarkhundarush must have also prompted him to call himself Subbiluliuma.

About the letter of Tarkhundarush, Professor Petrie writes (p. 26): "An early letter to Amenhotep the third cannot be regularly translated, as it is in an unknown language . . . from the personal name it would seem that the sender was a Hittite king, the word Tarkhun being well known as the name of the king Tarkudimme of the Silver Boss"—"From the letter can be gleaned the following, Tarkhundarush to Nimutrya (Amenhotep the third), Tarkhundarush sends Irshappa for a daughter of Nimutrya and sends a shuka of gold and will send a chariot, &c. Prince of the Khatti on the Mountains of Igaid sends a shuka weighing twenty manehs, three lak of ivory, &c."

Was ever so crude a proposal for a great king's daughter made? It sounds more like a purchase, no tributary prince could have written that letter to the King of Egypt and according to the Amarna Tablets the Hittites were tributary at that time, to Egypt. Igaid, mentioned by Tarkhundarush was, Professor Petrie thinks, the country of the Lebanon (*Syria and Egypt*, p. 27) and the Lebanon bounded the "Land of the Hittites" described in the Bible.

That Tarkhundarush wrote from the Land of the Hittites is probable but that he was no Hittite is shown by the way in which he writes to Amenhotep the third!

Even in Major Conder's more convincing version of the letter, in which instead of demanding Amenhotep's daughter, Tarkhundarush says that he is sending a woman to Amenhotep who was to be Queen Teie's servant. He begins his letter as only an equal of the Egyptian king could have done. With none of the servile protestations of the tributary rulers of Palestine, such as those of the ruler of Jerusalem who writes: "At the feet of my lord thus Adonizedek, at the feet of my lord, of the king seven times and seven times I bow, &c." (C., p. 140.) Very differently does Tarkhundarush begin his letter, he writes: "This letter to Nimutrya (Amenhotep III) the great king, the king of Egypt, from Tarkhundara the king of Arzapi, he says, I am at peace, may there be peace, to my abodes, to my wives, to my sons, to all my chiefs, to the soldiers and to my cavalry which are in my power, to the whole of my lands." After which

98 THE OLDEST LETTERS IN THE WORLD

egotistical preamble Tarkhundarush says: "May there be peace to thy abodes, to thy wives, to thy sons, to thy chiefs, &c."

That "the most imperial" of all the Egyptian kings as Dr. Hall calls Amenhotep the third (p. 300) was ever so addressed by a Hittite seems impossible. Yet it has been taken for granted that Tarkhundarush, the writer of that letter, was a Hittite prince. And Major Conder tells us why.

Writing about that letter and one other letter written in the same language he says: "The Berlin authority, Dr. Hugo Winckler decided that those letters were in the Hittite language, his reason being that one of them is written by a prince who was named Tarkhundarush and who called himself the Prince of the Hittites." (*Asiatic Journ.*, 1892.)

This reason evidently contented Major Conder, he says: "The name Tarkhundarush is enough to show that the writer was a Hittite." Enough it might be if the other "Hittite letter" had not been written by Dusratta of Mitanni.

That those two letters should be considered Hittite because someone calling himself the Prince of the Hittites wrote one of them any more than Mitannian because Dusratta of Mitanni wrote the other is unreasonable.

While Professor Winckler thinks those letters were in the Hittite language Professor Weber says that the one written by Dusratta is in the "Mitannisprache" (K., p. 1074) in which case, as both letters are admittedly "in the same language" Tarkhundarush must have also written in the "Mitannisprache."

Major Conder writes: "The existence of two letters, in the Tel-el-Amarna collection, written in quite a different language to that of the remainder, is undisputed. The longest of them is by Dusratta the Minnyan king. The other letter, from Tarkhundarush, the Hittite Prince of Rezep (Arzapi), in the Land of Itikai, north of Palmyria is apparently in the same language, which is no doubt Hittite." (C., p. 225.)

Major Conder then remarks: "And this agrees with the fact that Dusratta calls himself the Hittite suzerain" (p. 225). Why, because Dusratta calls himself the Hittite suzerain, a Hittite prince should have written in Dusratta's language the "Mitannisprache" is difficult to see.

Although Major Conder says that the language of the two letters was "no doubt Hittite" he says, speaking of the letter from Tarkhundarush, which he and Professor Winckler decided was in the Hittite language, that "the pronouns, particles and forms of the verb are also the same as those of the Minnyan language of Dusratta" (p. 227). And that both the letters begin in Dusratta's language and continue in that language mixed up with some other.

Why that language has been accepted as unquestionably Hittite when in all essentials it was Mitannian is inexplicable!

According to Professor Weber (K., p. 1074) the same mixed language was used by Amenhotep the third, in a letter addressed to Tarkhundarush. That that language was some kind of code arranged between the kings of Mitanni and Egypt seems much more probable than that it was the Hittite language.

The fact that those two letters are one of the clues to the so-called Hittite language helps to show on what a conjectural basis the "Hittite empire" rests.

As, at the time the letter of Tarkhundarush was written, Subbiluliuma, according to Dr. Hall and other writers, was the great king of the Hittites, Tarkhundarush's kingdom can only have been, as Dr. Hall remarks, a subsidiary kingdom; (p. 269) that he could have addressed the Egyptian king as an equal is improbable, that he could have demanded a daughter of Amenhotep "the Magnificent" in the manner quoted above is out of the question.

The strongest proof that Tarkhundarush was an assumed name of Dusratta of Mitanni is given by Amenhotep the third; in a letter written in the same mixed language as that of Tarkhundarush and which, as it was found at Tel-el-Amarna, was probably the replica of one sent to Syria, the Egyptian king writes to Tarkhundarush (Tarkhundaraba according to Professor Knudtzon whose translation I give).

He begins: "Thus has Nimutrya the Great King of Egypt spoken to Tarkhundaraba the King of Arzawa. To you have I sent my messenger, Irsappa, that he may say, for thy daughter who is to be the wife of my son have I sent oil for the head" (K., p. 273).

Dr. Weber surmises that the oil was for some anointing ceremony; probably, as the future wife of the heir to the Egyptian throne, the princess was to go through some ceremony.

If, as I believe, Amenhotep the third had adopted the Hebrew religion this is not strange; "the Holy Consecrating Oil" mentioned in the Book of Exodus xxx. 22, (Ferrer Fenton's Version) might well be meant. That oil, be it remarked, was never to be used upon strangers or foreigners . . . which the Hittites were considered by the Shemitic race. Now, since, according to the translators of the Tablets, the Hittites shortly after, if not before, Amenhotep the third's death attacked the Egyptian domains, a Hittite marriage could hardly have been desirable for the future king of Egypt. Considering too that, according to the same authorities, the Hittites were on hostile terms with Dusratta whose daughter was married to Amenhotep's son about that time it is not likely that Amenhotep would have tried to arrange a Hittite marriage for his son?

That Amenhotep's son had only one wife is generally admitted. And that that wife was Dusratta's daughter is amply proved by Dusratta's own letters as well as by the inventory of his daughter's wedding outfit mentioned before.

The following letters prove that Dusratta's daughter went to Egypt as the wife of Amenhotep the fourth, and that Dusratta's sister was the wife of Amenhotep the third. Dusratta writes to Amenhotep the third. "With me it is well, with you may it be well. With thy house, my sister and your other wives, with your children may it be well." He goes on to say that Amenhotep had sent a messenger to ask for his, Dusratta's daughter to be "the Queen of Egypt."

As Queen Teie was certainly the Queen of Egypt at that time "ruling both the king and court" according to Dr. Hall (p. 256) it could only have been to be the future Queen of Egypt, as wife to the future king, that Dusratta's daughter was asked for.

In a letter to Amenhotep the fourth, after Amenhotep the third's death, Dusratta says (C., p. 175): "When you favoured a daughter and sent for her, and as Amenophis the third, your

father knew her I rejoiced being exceeding glad," and he said, " My brother is it not thy wish thus to give the handmaid ? "

In a letter to Queen Teie Dusratta says (C., p. 190) : " To the Princess of the Land of Egypt, thus Dusratta of Mitanni, I am at peace. Peace be to thee . . . peace to thy son, peace be to Tadukhipa thy daughter-in-law . . . to thy land and to all that is thine be much, much peace ! Thou hast known how I have loved Amenophis the third, thy husband and Amenophis the third because he was thy husband how he loved me." (Where the name Amenophis appears in Major Conder's translations the original is Nimmuria or Nimutrya and where Amenophis the fourth appears it is Naphuria in the original.)

These letters prove that Dusratta's daughter went to Egypt as the wife of Amenhotep the fourth ; and that Dusratta's sister was the wife of Amenhotep the third can hardly be doubted. Amenhotep the third could hardly have been said to have loved Dusratta for Queen Teie's sake unless he was her brother ?

Amenhotep the third's mother had been an aunt of Dusratta ; with all these marriage connections with Mitanni how could Amenhotep have tried to arrange a marriage for his son with Dusratta's enemies, the Hittites ? Even if unsuspicious of the fact that they were on the point of attacking his possessions in Palestine. Yet, if we believe as the translators believe, that Amenhotep's letter to Tarkhudarush was written to a Hittite prince we must also believe that he tried to arrange a marriage for his son with a Hittite princess !

The only possible explanation of this mysterious letter is to my mind that it was written by Dusratta under the name of Tarkhundarush. This theory is supported by several facts:

According to Professor Weber (K., p. 1039) Tarkhundarush is called in the Boghaz Keuie Documents " Tarkhundimme, King of the Town of Mitanni." The Professor remarks that it is only the Hittites who speak of countries as towns. If, as I claim, the writers of those " Hittite Archives " were the priests of Syria or Babylonia, any absurdity found in them is explained.

That the writers called Tarkhundarush king of Mitanni

while at other times, they give the impression that he was a Hittite prince is interesting evidence upon my side. It shows too the inconsistency of the Boghaz Keuie Documents which give Subbiluliuma as the Hittite ruler who finally took Mitanni, and say nothing about Tarkhundarush having done so, although he is called the king of the "City Metan."

Professor Knudtzon (p. 1039) writes: "Tarkhundimme king of the land of the City Metan; his language adapted Hittite; the expression City Metan never used in the Amarna Tablets but only in the Hittite excavations."

Another reason exists for concluding that Tarkhundarush was Dusratta, King of Armenia and Mitanni. Upon the electrotype copy* of the "Boss of Tarkhondemos the king" whose name is taken to be the same as Tarkhundarush by Professor Sayce and other experts "Tarkhondemos" is said to be the King of Erme. The name Erme evidently meant Armenia, over which Dusratta ruled, for Armenia was called Ermenia by the Arabs, and Irmenistan by the Persians (Kitto's *Ency.*, Vol. 1, p. 220). On the same page we read that Armenia's most probable etymology "is that of Bochart, viz., that it was originally [Hebrew given] Har-Minni or Mount Minni, i.e., the High land of Minyas, or according to Wahl (in his work on Asia, (p. 807) the Heavenly Mountain, i.e., Ararat), for Mino in Zend, and MYNO, MYMY, in Parsee signify "Heaven, Heavenly." The word Erme therefore not only connects Tarkhundarush with Dusratta's country of Armenia but also with his people the Minnyans or Minni! That Tarkhundarush was called both King of Mitanni and of Armenia, that he writes in the same language as Dusratta, that he writes to Amenhotep the third as an equal, that his daughter is asked for by Amenhotep the third to be the future Queen of Egypt, and the fact that that future Queen of Egypt was Dusratta's daughter is overwhelming evidence that Tarkhundarush was Dusratta under an assumed name.†

* To be seen at the British Museum.

† According to Professor Sayce and Dr. Hall (p. 269) Tarkhundarush was the King of Azawa in Cilicia; this, as Tarkhundarush was really Dusratta, helps to show that Dusratta reigned in Asia Minor.

CHAPTER XV

DUSRATTA'S NAME FOR QUEEN TEIE

Before giving my reasons for believing that Subbiluliuma was only another name for Dusratta, invented by himself and chosen in later times by the plagiarizing priests for their fictitious king of the Hittites, I hope to show that Dusratta also invented a name for his sister Queen Teie of Egypt and by doing so threw a cloud over her identity, as he has done over his own.

That name was "Gilukhipa" which according to Major Conder meant "possessing glory" (p. 168). It puzzled Major Conder and made him doubt that Teie was Dusratta's sister; while it has convinced other writers that she was not a Mitannian princess at all.

Major Conder writes: "Perhaps Teie was Dusratta's cousin, she was certainly of royal birth and is represented as very fair but with dark hair" (p. 178) and "It seems clear from this letter that Teie, the Queen of Egypt, was related to Dusratta but it is not clear that she was his sister. Gilukhipa, the sister whom he names is known from Egyptian sources to have been daughter of Suttarna, Dusratta's father, and she came to Egypt with three hundred and seventeen ladies in her train" (p. 192).

The letter referred to, as showing that Teie was related to Dusratta is written to Teie by Dusratta. He says: "To . . . Princess of the Land of Egypt. Thus Dusratta King of Mitanni. I am at peace; peace be to thee . . . peace be to thy son. Peace be to Tadtukhipa, thy daughter-in-law, thou hast known of me how I loved Amenophis, the third, thy husband and Amenophis the third, because he was thy husband how he loved me . . . and Amenophis the third, because he was thy husband sent messages to me."

No wonder that Major Conder gathers from this letter that Teie was related to Dusratta. If it was avowedly for her sake that Amenhotep sent him messages and loved him, Teie must have certainly been a near relation of Dusratta. Could she have been anything less than a sister?

- Dr. Hall, however, concludes that Teie was not Dusratta's sister. He says that Amenhotep the third in marrying Teie had not followed the example of his father who had married a Mitannian princess. He writes: "The idea that she [Teie] was of Mitannian origin is now known to be erroneous . . . her father was attached to the court as King's Master of the Horse, and Captain of Chariotry . . . he married the court lady, Tuiu, and their daughter, Tii [Teie] attracted the attention of the young king, who married her." And, "but though Amenhotep did not imitate his father in taking to wife an entirely foreign princess yet he admitted a daughter of Mitanni to his harem as an inferior wife. This was Gilukhipa, daughter of Shutarna who was probably Amenhotep's maternal uncle" (p. 255-6).

That the three hundred and seventeen ladies brought to Egypt, as Major Conder and other writers tell us, by Gilukhipa would have been a formidable suite for an inferior wife to introduce into Amenhotep's harem, seems a natural reflection at this point!

Dr. Hall continues: "But there was no possibility of the Mitannian obtaining any real power at the Egyptian court, Teie ruled not only the court but the king also."

Teie must indeed have been sure of her own power to allow that influx of Mitannian ladies, not to mention Gilukhipa herself.

Dr. Hall goes on: "We may if we please see in the union of Amenhotep the third with Teie, evidence of a romantic element in the king's character . . . but the marriage had a political effect also; it enabled Amenhotep the third to keep the foreign princes at a more respectful distance than if he had taken the Mitannian princess as his chief wife" (p. 256).

It was Teie however who (according to Dr. Hall) was not a Mitannian princess who is shown by Dusratta's letters to have been the bond of friendship between the Mitannians and the

Egyptian king. Dr. Hall must have overlooked the following letters. In one of them Dusratta says to Queen Teie (p. 191), "and Amenhotep the third, because he was thy husband sent messages to me." In another letter (Winckler, p. 51), Dusratta says to Amenhotep the fourth, "With you with your mother Ti (Teie) with my daughter, Tadukhipa, your wife, may it be well. From the days of my youth, Nimmuria (Amenhotep the third) your father wrote to me of friendship . . . all the words of your father which he wrote me, Ti, the distinguished wife of Nimmuria, the loved one, your mother, she knew them all. Ask Ti, your mother in regard to all those things which your father negotiated with me."

In another letter given by Major Conder (p. 177), Dusratta writes to Amenhotep the fourth, soon after his father's death. "The great King of Mitanni, thy kinsman who loves thee. I am at peace . . . to the Lady Teie, to Tadukhipa my daughter, thy wife be peace . . . Amenhotep thy father he sent to me . . . Your mother knew all the messages he addressed to me . . . and when Amenhotep the third was obliged to be taken to his fate and they told me . . . I tore my cheeks and I mourned . . . I took no food or water . . . and I was grieved . . . I said, 'Let me perish myself from the earth' . . . and that he loved me, God knows and he was loved . . . I say thus, Amenophis the fourth is my brother whom we shall love in our hearts . . . the son of Amenophis the third, more than his father, because of Teie his mother."

Why, unless Teie was Dusratta's sister, did Amenhotep send messages to Dusratta for her sake? Why, unless Teie was Dusratta's sister, should Dusratta have loved her son more than her husband for her sake? Professor Winckler gives a letter in which Dusratta says (p. 81): "All the words which I discussed with your father, your mother knows them all, no one else knows them."

Where then was Gilukhipa? Why was she, the Mitannian princess, Dusratta's sister, left out in this correspondence?

My conviction is that Teie and Gilukhipa were the same person, a possibility which does not seem to have occurred to

the translators. From scarabs upon which the priests announce that Amenhotep the third married Gilukhipa, daughter of Sutarna of Naharin, Dusratta's father, and that at that time, Teie was the Queen of Egypt; also from certain mummies (referred to later) labelled by the priests with the suspiciously comic names of Juiu and Tuiu, and said by them to be Teie's father and mother, it has been concluded that Teie was not Dusratta's sister. That Teie was not Dusratta's sister is also the opinion of Sir Ernest Budge (*British Museum Catalogue*, p. 233). He says that Amenhotep married a daughter of Shutarna of Mitani, and also married Gilukhipa, a sister of Dusratta of Mitanni, who he says arrived in Egypt with three hundred and seventeen ladies.

As Shutarna, King of Mitani, was Dusratta's father, Shutarna's daughter who, according to Sir Ernest Budge, married Amenhotep must have been Dusratta's sister as well as Gilukhipa! Amenhotep the third must then, according to Sir Ernest Budge, have married two of Dusratta's sisters, Gilukhipa and another.

Considering that, as the following letter shows, Mitannian princesses were not easily won by Egyptian kings, it seems unlikely that two of Dusratta's sisters went to Egypt to marry the same king.

Dusratta writes to Amenhotep the fourth, after Amenhotep the third's death (K., p. 267). He first describes how Thothmes the fourth (Manahbiria) had to send five or six times to Mitanni to ask for a wife before she was allowed to go to Egypt. That princess was Dusratta's aunt.

He then says: "Formerly, when Nimmuria (Amenhotep III) thy father sent to ask for my sister, three and four times he asked but was not given her. When Nimmuria thy father sent to me for my daughter, I said (before his messengers I spoke) I will certainly give her." In this detailed account of the way in which Egyptian requests for Mitannian princesses had been received Dusratta only speaks of an Aunt, one sister and a daughter. Why, if as Sir Ernest Budge thinks, two of Dusratta's sisters went to Egypt as wives to Amenhotep the third, does Dusratta only mention one of them?

This letter indicates that only one Mitannian princess was married to Amenhotep the third. My contention is that she was Teie, who was called Gilukhipa in a letter from Dusratta. My further contention is that that letter proves that this was the case.

Dusratta begins the letter (C., p. 164) : " To Neb-mat-ra (Nimmuria) my brother, by letter, thus Tuseratta, King of Mitanni, thy brother. I am at peace. Peace be to thee ; to Gilukhipa my sister be peace." Dusratta then describes his victory over the Hittites and says : " Now I have sent thee a chariot with two horses, a young man and a young woman of the spoil of the land of the Hittites. I have sent thee, as a present to my brother, five chariots and five yoke of horses. And as a present to Gilukhipa my sister, I have sent . . . of gold, a pair of gold ear-rings and . . . of gold and goodly stones."

The enlightening thing about this letter is that Dusratta never even mentions the great Queen Teie, for whose sake he and Amenhotep the third loved one another, for whose sake he was sent messages from Egypt, for whose sake he was to love Amenhotep the fourth more even than his old friend Amenhotep the third, and with whom he was, as his letters prove, to negotiate after her husband's death.

Teie was certainly alive at that time ; she is said to have married Amenhotep the third early in his reign and to have outlived him. As we have seen, upon the scarabs announcing Gilukhipa's marriage, Teie is said to be the Queen of Egypt. Even the priests did not try to hide that fact ; nor did they suggest that Gilukhipa ever usurped Teie's position in Egypt, for another scarab tells how the year after his (supposed) marriage with Gilukhipa Amenhotep constructed a great lake in honour of Queen Teie (Breasted, *Egypt*, Vol. IV, p. 347).

Yet in this important letter Dusratta sends messages and presents to Gilukhipa and not one word to Teie.

Considering all the circumstances, this is, I maintain, proof positive that Gilukhipa was Teie under another name. Dusratta could not possibly have ignored Teie in that letter.

As we have seen, the name Gilukhipa meant " possessing

glory." What more likely than that Dusratta, who we know could be playful, called his sister Teie, "Gilukhipa" upon this great occasion when she, as a Mitannian princess, attained reflected glory through the victory of her brother the King of Mitanni over the Hittites?

• Professor Knudtzon's version of this important letter is much the same as Major Conder's. In it Gilukhipa is mentioned twice and Teie not at all (K., p. 131).

Like Major Conder, Mr. Weigall seems puzzled about Queen Teie. Although he believes her to have been the daughter of the courtiers, Juau and Tuau and says: "Juau and Tuau became the proud parents-in-law of the Pharaoh," he adds: "But she (Teie) became his great Queen, was placed on the throne beside him, and received honours which no other queen of the most royal blood had ever received before. It is clear that the king's advisers would never have permitted this had Tiy been but the pretty daughter of a noble of the court. There must have been something in her parentage which entitled her to these honours and caused her to be chosen deliberately as queen" and "Tuau may have had royal blood in her veins and may have been, for instance, the grand-daughter of Thutmosis III, to whom she bears some likeness in face." Queen Tii is often called "Royal daughter" as well as "Royal wife" and it is possible that this is to be taken literally. In a letter sent by Dusratta, King of Mitanni, to Akhnaton, Tiy is called "my sister and thy mother" (*Akhnaton*, p. 26). In spite of this strong evidence that Tiy was Dusratta's sister, Mr. Weigall still doubts that fact. Even without that letter which I have not seen the evidence is strong enough in my opinion to prove that Teie was Dusratta's sister. Since therefore Teie was Dusratta's sister and the story of her parents being courtiers at Amenhotep's court only an invention of the priests, the important question arises (only to be briefly touched upon here) whose were the mummies labelled as Juui and Tuui? The inner coffin lids had been removed when they were discovered by Mr. Theodore Davis, probably because the real names of the occupants had been upon them, the linen bandages glued to the bodies had been

scratched off (Mr. Davis thinks) by human nails, objects found with them were strewn about in disorder and many of them were broken. Evidently no reverent hands had placed those mummies in the rock tomb where they were found ; yet, for some important reason, they had been preserved and carefully hidden away.

Mr. Davis (*Tombs of Juia and Touiu*) remarks upon the extraordinary dignity of the woman's mummy and by a drawing given of the man's profile we can judge of the commanding face of the supposed Jouia. It is much like that of the mummy believed to be Rameses the second ! My belief is that the mummies are those of Amenhotep, "the Magnificent," and Queen Teie, which had been removed from their original tombs by the priests who, in all probability, had murdered Amenhotep the fourth and his family.

Unusually fine alabaster vases found in the tomb are actually inscribed with the names of Amenhotep and Queen Teie, while in inscriptions found there the mummy of the man is called "Divine Father," "Royal Ornament" "and Father of the Lord of the Two Lands." Strange titles for even the mocking priests to apply to a courtier. The accepted opinion is that robbers had disturbed the tomb. If so, they were uncommon ones, for, after spending much time in scratching off the mummy wrappings with their nails, they went away leaving behind them a gold and lapis lazuli necklace, a gold plate and other valuables ! (Davis, *Jouiu and Tuiaua*.)

According to Professor Breasted the names given as Jouiu and Tuiaua were in the original Jwy' and Twy' (*Anc. Egypt*, Vol. 2, p. 348). The resemblance between Twy, and Tii or Teie is unmistakable. Obviously, as Queen Teie was the daughter of the king of Mitanni, the father of Dusratta, the mummies of Jwy and Twy, were not those of her parents, and as Teie and Gilukhipa were the same person the marriage scarabs of Amenhotep the third with Gilukhipa during Teie's lifetime must also have been a priestly hoax !

As therefore, the names Jwy and Twy were invented by the priests as were the names of the Hyksos kings and those of Thothmes and Amenhotep the question inevitably

occurs— can we believe in any names given in the priestly inscriptions ?

Can we believe, for instance in the existence of the three kings called respectively, Sakere, Tutenkhamen and Eye, who are believed to have reigned in succession after Amenhotep the fourth, but whose united reigns only lasted, according to Professor Breasted about eight years and whose names do not inspire confidence.

That the Egyptian priests had something to hide is certain. The Hebrew religion, the True Religion, accompanied by truthful art, had twice reigned in Egypt, first under the Hyksos kings and secondly under the Heretic kings and my conviction is that the Egyptian priests' great effort, after that religion had been abolished, was to hide all traces of it and to credit themselves with any writings and customs, belonging to the Hebrew religion, which they allowed to remain in Egypt.

CHAPTER XVI

DUSRATTA'S DAUGHTER

A STATEMENT of Dr. Hall's must, incidentally, be looked into, for if it were true, my theory of the adoption of the Hebrew religion by not only Amenhotep the fourth but also by his father and grandfather would be untenable.

Dr. Hall writes (p. 158): "When Amenhotep the third, died, Dushratta writes profuse condolences to his successor, with greetings to the queen mother, Tii, and also to Tadukhipa whom he mentions as Amenhotep the fourth's wife. . . . It is evident that Amenhotep had succeeded to his father's young Mitannian wife."

Such a marriage being impossible under the Hebrew law, this, if a fact, would prove that neither Amenhotep the fourth nor his father had adopted the Hebrew religion."

The Amarna Tablets refute this statement as Major Conder saw, for he writes: "There is no statement that shows Dusratta's daughter to have married Amenophis the third. She married his son and is called the "daughter-in-law of Queen Teie" (p. 170).

Major Conder gives a letter (p. 179) in which Dusratta says to Amenhotep the third: "Since your forefathers were friendly with my forefathers, thou therefore wast very greatly friendly with my father. So you love me; we are zealous friends; ten times more you increase it than to my father. And so my brother sent Mani his envoy. Thus indeed my brother (said) 'Does not my brother's heart desire that thy daughter be the wife of my young son, as a princess of Egypt.'"

To Amenhotep the fourth, after his father's death, Dusratta writes: "When you favoured a daughter and so (sent for) her, and as Amenophis the third, your father knew her . . .

I rejoiced being exceedingly glad and he said : ' My brother is not it thy wish thus to give the handmaid ' and he made public agreement with this his land, in presence of my envoy . . . and in the cities which for Tadukhipa . . . in all of them he made us dwell as conquerors " (p. 178).

While these letters show that Dusratta's daughter went to Egypt to be married to Amenhotep the fourth other letters translated by German professors have been thought to prove that Dusratta's daughter married Amenhotep the third.

In one of them Dusratta writes to Amenhotep the third (K., p. 145) : " Now in this year will I give my brother's wife, the Mistress of Egypt. They will bring her to my brother. So then Hanigalbat (Dusratta's land) and Egypt will. . . " (The rest of the sentence is lost.) Evidently, because of that marriage, Dusratta's country and Egypt were to continue on friendly terms.

Although, at first sight, this letter might seem to prove that Dusratta's daughter was being sent to Egypt to marry Amenhotep the third, I contend that, it proves, on the contrary, that she married his son.

How could Dusratta have insulted the great Queen Teie whose friendship meant so much to him and whom he calls in another of Professor Knudtzon's translations (p. 241) : " The Mistress of Egypt " by suggesting that his daughter should go to Egypt to marry Teie's husband, and to be the " Mistress of Egypt " during Teie's lifetime ?

In another letter written to Amenhotep the fourth, Dusratta says : " And all the words which I said to thy father, thy mother knew, no one else knew them " (K., p. 243).

What would Teie have thought of Dusratta's words : " I will give my brother's wife, the Mistress of Egypt "—unless she had understood that Dusratta's daughter was to be the future Queen of Egypt as wife to her son the future King ?

What would Teie, who was the link of friendship between the kings of Egypt and Mitanni have thought of Dusratta's words, suggesting that his daughter should be that link unless she had understood that Dusratta was referring to the future of those countries ?

Sir Ernest Budge tells us that Dusratta, in writing to Amenhotep the third, calls his daughter Tadukhipa, "your bride." This might convince us that Tadukhipa married Amenhotep the third, if we did not find on p. 67, of Professor Winckler's book that Dusratta also calls Tadukhipa Queen Teie's "bride." Evidently the word Kallatika which has been translated into bride means something else; probably daughter-in-law, which is Major Conder's translation of that word.

Professor Petrie publishes Winckler's translation of the letter in which Dusratta greets Teie, her son and Tadukhipa, her son's bride, and in which he also asks Teie to write to his own wife, Juni (p. 32). The Professor remarks: "This letter is conclusive as to Tadukhipa being the daughter of Dushratta and wife of Amenhotep the fourth. On no monuments is there any trace of any other wife of that king, and from the great prominence of Nefertiti, Akhenaten's devotion to her and the absence of any children but hers (although all hers were daughters), it seems that Nefertiti must be this wife, Tadukhipa." Surely the fact that it was during Queen Teie's lifetime that Dusratta wrote to Egypt about his daughter becoming the Queen of Egypt proves that she was to marry Queen Teie's son and not Queen Teie's husband as some writers believe! That Dusratta and Amenhotep the third, could have meant Tadukhipa to be the Queen of Egypt during Teie's lifetime is incredible, especially as it is known that Teie was co-regent of Egypt for a time after her husband's death!

CHAPTER XVII

SUBBILULIUMA

FINALLY we come to the name Subbiluliuma ! Which according to Professor Hogarth, Dr. Hall and other authorities, belonged to a great Hittite king.

Dr. Hall seems full of admiration for Subbiluliuma. He calls him a "great conqueror" and "the Hittite Bismarck." He speaks of his "cautious yet calculating policy of years," and says that "as an old man he reigned undisputed lord over the whole of North Western Asia" (p. 352).

He also describes the ruins of what he supposes was Subbiluliuma's capital city in Asia Minor, which city I venture to suggest was more probably Dusratta's western capital. He writes : "Here, in an upland valley east of the Halys are the remains of the capital city of the Hittites. . . This was the inmost lair of the Hittite spider" (p. 338).

After explaining its position Dr. Hall says that the space occupied by the city was 2,200 metres by 1,100 metres, that the circuit of the walls was 5,500 metres in length and that parts of it resembled the buildings of Tyrrhens and the palaces of Achaean Greece. Dr. Hall further describes it as "a fortress city situated three thousand feet above the sea in a rugged land where snow lies throughout the winter and the summer is bright and invigorating as that of Europe" (p. 339).

That fortress city (if I am right in believing that Subbiluliuma was Dusratta) was probably where that king, and, before they went to Egypt, his sister Teie and his daughter Tadukhipa spent their summers.

Dr. Hall writes : "Subbiluliuma, King of the Hittites had conquered the lands Naharin and Nukhashi from Dusratta shortly before the death of Amenhotep the third, and upon

the accession of Amenhotep the fourth, he sent, with an ill grace, a somewhat surly letter of congratulations to the new king of Egypt."

This letter has been found at Tel-el-Amarna and has been published by Professor Knudtzon (p. 299).

The writer begins with protestations of affection and friendship towards Amenhotep the fourth. There is nothing surly in the beginning of the letter.

Subbiluliuma then hopes that the Egyptian king may be as obliging to him as his father had been, he then reproaches Amenhotep with having been "lazy" in fulfilling engagements made by his father (K., p. 1092).

In Professor Knudtzon's translation of the letter, Dusratta says, "Particularly shall Huri, who seems lazy, fulfil his fathers engagements."

Subbiluliuma uses almost the same words as Dusratta, in writing to the Egyptian kings. Like Dusratta he calls Amenhotep his brother and like him again, says, "With me it is well, with thee may it be well." The only difference is that Dusratta calls Amenhotep his son-in-law as well as his brother while Subbiluliuma only calls the Egyptian king "my brother." If, however, Subbiluliuma was Dusratta, as the letter seems to prove he was, and was pretending to be a Hittite king, he would naturally not mention that Amenhotep was his son-in-law as that would have identified him, for his daughter Tadukhipa was Amenhotep's only wife. The remarkable thing about Subbiluliuma's letter is that the writer calls Amenhotep the fourth, "Huri."

He says: "In the following manner has Subbiluliuma, the great king of the Hittites spoken to Huri, King of Egypt, my brother, with me it is well, etc." That Subbiluliuma should address Amenhotep the fourth, as "Huri" while Amenhotep's father-in-law Dusratta addresses him as Naphuria is illuminating.

For "Huri" is evidently an abbreviation of Naphuria as Professor Weber remarks (K., p. 1092).

Dusratta, Amenhotep's playful uncle might have called him "Huri," but a Hittite king could hardly have done so.

Dusratta might have playfully accused Amenhotep of being "lazy" but that a Hittite king should have done so is most unlikely. That Subbiluliuma, if a Hittite king, as he is believed to have been, could have been on affectionate and intimate terms with the Egyptian king when, according to Dr. Hall, the Hittites had attacked the Egyptian possessions in Palestine about that time and had conquered a large part of Dusratta's country, which the Egyptian king might well have resented upon his father-in-law's behalf seems impossible.

Yet, if Subbiluliuma had been really a Hittite king that must have been the case.

The impossibility of this proves to my mind that Subbiluliuma was no Hittite, and can only have been Dusratta of Mitanni under an assumed name.

The constant confusion in Ribaddi's letters, when referring to the "King of the Hittites" and Dusratta, taken in connection with the fact that Dusratta had taken possession of Hittite cities and had called himself the chief of the Hittites, is strong evidence that Dusratta was the King of the Hittites mentioned in those letters.

That the "King of the Hittites" is shown by the Tablets to have fought on the side of the Israelites against the Canaanites proves that he cannot have really been a Hittite king, and can only have been Dusratta who undoubtedly helped Joshua to conquer the Canaanites of Phoenicia.

Finally, in face of the letter from Dusratta to his nephew Amenhotep the Fourth, Subbiluliuma, the pretended Hittite King, and his co-called "Great Hittite Empire" disappear.

Any reader who is convinced by my arguments will realise that the contemporary priests, with their lies which are "Half the Truth" and therefore difficult to detect, have successfully befogged ancient history, and will appreciate the irony of the fact that the translators, though ignoring Dusratta's claim to victory over the Hittites, hail him when calling himself Subbiluliuma, as a great Hittite King.

930/BRI



12001



299.58